Library

St. Olaf College

Northfield, Minn.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/russianschoolsun0000paul

RUSSIAN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE WORLD WAR

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE WORLD WAR

JAMES T. SHOTWELL, LL.D., *General Editor.*

RUSSIAN SERIES

SIR PAUL VINOGRADOFF, F.B.A., *Editor.*
(Died, 19th December 1925.)

MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY, M.A., *Associate Editor.*

RUSSIAN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE WORLD WAR

INTRODUCTION

BY COUNT PAUL N. IGNATIEV

FORMERLY MINISTER OF EDUCATION OF RUSSIA

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

BY DIMITRY M. ODINETZ

FORMERLY PRINCIPAL OF THE STOLBTSOV JUNIOR COLLEGE, PETROGRAD

UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

BY PAUL J. NOVGOROTSEV

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MOSCOW

NEW HAVEN : YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD : OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
FOR THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE : DIVISION OF ECONOMICS AND HISTORY
1929

LA832
.R8

Copyright 1929 by the
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

Printed in the United States of America

EDITOR'S PREFACE

In the autumn of 1914, when the scientific study of the effects of war upon modern life passed suddenly from theory to history, the Division of Economics and History of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace proposed to adjust the program of its researches to the new and altered problems which the War presented. The existing program, which had been prepared as the result of a conference of economists held at Berne in 1911, and which dealt with the facts then at hand, had just begun to show the quality of its contributions; but for many reasons it could no longer be followed out. A plan was therefore drawn up at the request of the Director of the Division, in which it was proposed, by means of an historical survey, to attempt to measure the economic cost of the War and the displacement which it was causing in the processes of civilization. Such an "Economic and Social History of the World War," it was felt, if undertaken by men of judicial temper and adequate training, might ultimately, by reason of its scientific obligations to truth, furnish data for the forming of sound public opinion, and thus contribute fundamentally toward the aims of an institution dedicated to the cause of international peace.

The need for such an analysis, conceived and executed in the spirit of historical research, was increasingly obvious as the War developed, releasing complex forces of national life not only for the vast process of destruction, but also for the stimulation of new capacities for production. This new economic activity, which under normal conditions of peace might have been a gain to society, and the surprising capacity exhibited by the belligerent nations for enduring long and increasing loss—often while presenting the outward semblance of new prosperity—made necessary a reconsideration of the whole field of war economics. A double obligation was therefore placed upon the Division of Economics and History. It was obliged to concentrate its work upon the problem thus presented, and to study it as a whole; in other words, to apply to it the tests and disciplines of history. Just as the War itself was a single event, though penetrating by seemingly unconnected ways to the remotest parts of the world, so the analysis of it must be developed

according to a plan at once all embracing and yet adjustable to the practical limits of the available data.

During the actual progress of the War, however, the execution of this plan for a scientific and objective study of war economics proved impossible in any large and authoritative way. Incidental studies and surveys of portions of the field could be made and were made under the direction of the Division, but it was impossible to undertake a general history for obvious reasons. In the first place, an authoritative statement of the resources of belligerents bore directly on the conduct of armies in the field. The result was to remove as far as possible from scrutiny those data of the economic life of the countries at war which would ordinarily, in time of peace, be readily available for investigation. In addition to this difficulty of consulting documents, collaborators competent to deal with them were for the most part called into national service in the belligerent countries and so were unavailable for research. The plan for a war history was therefore postponed until conditions should arise which would make possible not only access to essential documents, but also the coöperation of economists, historians, and men of affairs in the nations chiefly concerned, whose joint work would not be misunderstood either in purpose or in content.

Upon the termination of the War, the Endowment once more took up the original plan, and it was found with but slight modification to be applicable to the situation. Work was begun in the summer and autumn of 1918. In the first place a final conference of the Advisory Board of Economists of the Division of Economics and History was held in Paris, which limited itself to planning a series of short preliminary surveys of special fields. Since, however, the purely preliminary character of such studies was further emphasized by the fact that they were directed more especially toward those problems which were then fronting Europe as questions of urgency, it was considered best not to treat them as part of the general survey, but rather as of contemporary value in the period of war settlement. It was clear that not only could no general program be laid down *a priori* by this conference as a whole, but that a new and more highly specialized research organization than that already existing would be needed to undertake the Economic and Social History of the World War, one based more upon national grounds in the first instance, and less upon purely international coöperation. Until the

facts of national history could be ascertained, it would be impossible to proceed with comparative analysis; and the different national histories were themselves of almost baffling intricacy and variety. Consequently the former European Committee of Research was dissolved, and in its place it was decided to erect an Editorial Board in each of the larger countries and to nominate special editors in the smaller ones, who should concentrate, for the present at least, upon their own economic and social war history.

The nomination of these boards by the General Editor was the first step taken in every country where the work has begun. And if any justification were needed for the plan of the Endowment, it at once may be found in the lists of those, distinguished in scholarship or in public affairs, who have accepted the responsibility of editorship. This responsibility is by no means light, involving as it does the adaptation of the general editorial plan to the varying demands of national circumstances or methods of work; and the measure of success attained is due to the generous and earnest coöperation of those in charge in each country.

Once the editorial organization was established, there could be little doubt as to the first step which should be taken in each instance toward the actual preparation of the history. Without documents there can be no history. The essential records of the War, local as well as central, have therefore to be preserved and to be made available for research in so far as is compatible with public interest. But this archival task is a very great one, belonging of right to the Governments and other owners of historical sources and not to the historian or economist who proposes to use them. It is an obligation of ownership; for all such documents are public trust. The collaborators on this section of the war history, therefore, working within their own field as researchers, could only survey the situation as they found it and report their findings in the forms of guides or manuals; and perhaps, by stimulating a comparison of methods, help to further the adoption of those found to be most practical. In every country, therefore, this was the point of departure for actual work; although special monographs have not been written in every instance.

The first stage of the work upon the War History, dealing with little more than the externals of archives, seemed for a while to exhaust the possibilities of research, and had the plan of the history been limited to research based upon official documents, little more

could have been done, for once documents have been labeled "secret" few government officials can be found with sufficient courage or initiative to break open the seal. Thus vast masses of source material essential for the historian were effectively placed beyond his reach, although much of it was quite harmless from any point of view. While war conditions thus continued to hamper research, and were likely to do so for many years to come, some alternative had to be found.

Fortunately such an alternative was at hand in the narrative, amply supported by documentary evidence, of those who had played some part in the conduct of affairs during the War, or who, as close observers in privileged positions, were able to record from first or at least second-hand knowledge the economic history of different phases of the Great War, and of its effect upon society. Thus a series of monographs was planned consisting for the most part of unofficial yet authoritative statements, descriptive or historical, which may best be described as about halfway between memoirs and blue-books. These monographs make up the main body of the work assigned so far. They are not limited to contemporary war-time studies; for the economic history of the War must deal with a longer period than that of the actual fighting. It must cover the years of "deflation" as well, at least sufficiently to secure some fairer measure of the economic displacement than is possible in purely contemporary judgments.

With this phase of the work, the editorial problems assumed a new aspect. The series of monographs had to be planned primarily with regard to the availability of contributors, rather than of source material as in the case of most histories; for the contributors themselves controlled the sources. This in turn involved a new attitude toward those two ideals which historians have sought to emphasize, consistency and objectivity. In order to bring out the chief contribution of each writer it was impossible to keep within narrowly logical outlines; facts would have to be repeated in different settings and seen from different angles, and sections included which do not lie within the strict limits of history; and absolute objectivity could not be obtained in every part. Under the stress of controversy or apology, partial views would here and there find their expression. But these views are in some instances an intrinsic part of the history itself, contemporary measurements of facts as significant as the

facts with which they deal. Moreover, the work as a whole is planned to furnish its own corrective; and where it does not, others will.

In addition to the monographic treatment of source material, a number of studies by specialists are already in preparation, dealing with technical or limited subjects, historical or statistical. These monographs also partake to some extent of the nature of first-hand material, registering as they do the data of history close enough to the source to permit verification in ways impossible later. But they also belong to that constructive process by which history passes from analysis to synthesis. The process is a long and difficult one, however, and work upon it has only just begun. To quote an apt characterization; in the first stages of a history like this, one is only "picking cotton." The tangled threads of events have still to be woven into the pattern of history; and for this creative and constructive work different plans and organizations may be needed.

In a work which is the product of so complex and varied coöperation as this, it is impossible to indicate in any but a most general way the apportionment of responsibility of editors and authors for the contents of the different monographs. For the plan of the History as a whole and its effective execution the General Editor is responsible; but the arrangement of the detailed programs of study has been largely the work of the different Editorial Boards and divisional Editors, who have also read the manuscripts prepared under their direction. The acceptance of the monograph in this series, however, does not commit the editors to the opinions or conclusions of the authors. Like other editors, they are asked to vouch for the scientific merit, the appropriateness and usefulness of the volumes admitted to the series; but the authors are naturally free to make their individual contributions in their own way. In like manner the publication of the monographs does not commit the Endowment to agreement with any specific conclusions which may be expressed therein. The responsibility of the Endowment is to History itself—an obligation not to avoid but to secure and preserve variant narratives and points of view, in so far as they are essential for the understanding of the War as a whole.

* * * * *

In the case of Russia, civil war and revolution followed so closely upon the World War that it is almost impossible for history to

measure with any degree of accuracy the effects of the World War itself upon the economic and social life of the country. Those effects were so distorted by the forces let loose in the post-war years and so confused with the disturbances of the revolutionary era that the attempt to isolate the phenomena of the War from the data of civil war and to analyze the former according to the plan followed in the other national series of this collection has been a task of unparalleled difficulty. Over and above the intricacies of the problem and its illusive character, the authors of the Russian monographs have had to work under the most discouraging circumstances and with inadequate implements of research. For those who know the scarcity of the documentary material available, it will be a matter of no little surprise to find, in the pages of this Russian Series, narratives and substantiating data which measure up so well in comparison with those prepared by the collaborators in other countries. The achievement of the Russian Division of the History is, all things considered, the most remarkable section of the entire collection. This is due, in the first place, to the fact that the authors, all of them exiles who live in foreign lands, have not only brought to this task the scientific disciplines of their own special fields but also an expert knowledge drawn from personal experience which in several instances reached to the highest offices of State.

While these volumes in the Russian History constitute so very considerable an achievement, they cannot in the very nature of the case cover with adequate statistical or other specific data many of the problems with which they deal. No one is more conscious of their shortcomings in this regard than the authors themselves. Nevertheless, with inadequate material and under hampering circumstances they have prepared a body of text and a record which, if admittedly incomplete as history, contains at least one element that would otherwise be lost for the future understanding of this great crisis in human affairs, an element which no other generation working from Russian archives could ever supply. We have here the mature comment upon events by contemporaries capable of passing judgment and appraising values, so that over and above the survey of phenomena there is presented a perspective and an organization of material which will be a contribution to history hardly less important than the substance of the monographs.

The Russian Series was in the first instance planned by one of the

most distinguished of Russian scholars who had long been a resident of England, Sir Paul Vinogradoff, Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Oxford. To the planning of the Series Sir Paul gave much time and thought. His untimely death in December, 1925, prevented him from seeing its fruition or from assuming the editorial responsibility for the texts. Nevertheless, the Series as a whole remains substantially as he had planned it.

J. T. S.

CONTENTS

Introduction. xvii

I

RUSSIAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS DURING THE WAR

CHAPTER I

The Primary and Secondary Schools before the War. . . 3

1. Primary Schools in 1914.
2. Secondary Schools in 1914.

CHAPTER II

The Immediate Effects of the War on Primary and Secondary Education in Russia. 57

1. The War and the Primary Schools in 1914-1915.
2. The War and the Secondary Schools in 1914-1915.

CHAPTER III

The Growing Influence of the War on Education. . . . 87

1. The Primary Schools from the Autumn of 1915 to 1917.
2. The Secondary Schools from the Autumn of 1915 to 1917.

CHAPTER IV

The New School Policy of the Ministry of Education. . . 97

CHAPTER V

Primary and Secondary Education in 1917, to the October Revolution. 119

II

RUSSIAN UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS DURING THE WAR

CHAPTER I

Institutions of Higher Education before the War. . . 133

University education in Russia. Conditions of its development. Russian universities after 1905. Increase of university education before the War. Policy of the Ministry of Education.

CHAPTER II

Universities and Higher Technical Schools during the War up to the Revolution of February 1917. 154

Outbreak of war. General patriotic enthusiasm and efforts for national unity. Declaration of German professors concerning the War and attitude of Russian professors toward it. Entry of the students into the army and the organizations of the All-Russian Unions of Zemstvos and Towns. New tasks of the universities. Organization of hospitals and war work. Creation of Special Councils for Defense, Transport, Food Supply, and Fuel. Organization of special committees in the universities. Mobilization of students.

CHAPTER III

Social and Economic Effects of the War on the Universities and Higher Technical Schools. 194

Policy of Count Ignatiev. Financial difficulties and their effect on the life of the universities. Effects of economic difficulties upon students' life. Great reduction in the number of students. Changes in the position of the student body and in the mentality of the students. Revival of interest in students' organizations. Revival of hostility to the Government. Objections to conscription. General crisis of the Autumn of 1916. First signs of the coming Revolution.

CHAPTER IV

Universities and Higher Technical Schools during the Revolution of 1917. 221

Cessation of work in the universities after the Revolution. Students' attempts to reform academic relations. Interest in problems of State reform and in the agrarian reform. Decline of interest in the War. Participation of the students in the political parties and in the political education of the people. Policy of the Provisional Government in regard to the universities. Deterioration of material condition of the universities.

CHAPTER V

Social and Economic Effects of the Revolution on the Universities and Higher Technical Schools. 235

Development of the Russian Revolution. General process of dislocation as reflected in the life of universities. Resumption of studies in the autumn of 1917. Preparations for elections to the Constituent Assembly. October *coup d'état.*

INTRODUCTION

It is doubtful if history can ever fully measure the consequences of the World War, reaching as it did into every field of human interest and involving all the elements of modern civilization. The economic effects, to be sure, lend themselves to statistical measurement in so far as the data are recoverable; but the social and psychological influences present no such standard of measurement and are by their very nature elusive and changing in both form and content as the War recedes into the past and other social phenomena take its place. But there is no more important inquiry than that with which this volume deals, for the effect of war upon the mental life and growth of the peoples who were drawn into it is, after all, of much greater significance than the mere loss of material wealth. The fact that no one can answer this question fully does not make it any the less valid. For the instruction of future generations this story of the influence of war and of war psychology upon a nation's intellectual development and its educational system is a contribution to the understanding of history itself and, properly analyzed, one of the greatest lessons in the cause of peace.

The Economic and Social History of the World War is much more than an analysis of the War itself. It enables us to understand those processes within society which are the vital element in the upward march of civilization. The War enabled us to understand still better than we had ever done before that vast complex of ideals and achievement, which is the world of today. The displacement which it caused in the normal processes of national life revealed the strength of tendencies within the nation and ties between nations which had hardly been appreciated before. The great collection of histories, of which this volume forms a part, is therefore something more than a mere record of a single chapter of contemporary events. It draws a lesson from the past which should help to keep our human community, aghast at what it has been through, from having to endure such tragedy again. To the reader of these pages that hoary saying, "If you wish for peace, prepare for war," will surely carry little conviction now. The spirit of man has laid hold upon another, "If you wish for peace, prepare for peace."

If, again, we are to study the effects of war, it will above all profit

us to study them in Russia. For there the War has had results which for years have held the thoughts of all the world. Not, be it said at once, that we will profit much if we dwell only on those things that cannot now be undone, if we do no more than point to the ruin and the horrors that the War has wrought. For in time even war's worst horrors pass and are forgotten. If we would lay the foundations of a peace that will endure, we must have a plan, we must find foundation stones that we can really build upon. We know well that there are such foundations. The first of them lies in a right education of the masses, in schools that will throw open to coming generations the books of truth, in schools that truly teach, that, making themselves a part of life, can veritably give it. And here, too, we can learn something from Russia. As the following pages show, she was preparing a mighty effort to offer such teaching to her too-little enlightened millions when the War came upon her, thwarted that effort, and even lost to her much of what she had already gained.

This is told in these pages by Professor Novgorotsev and M. Odinetz. And they also show how great a blow is struck by war at the cultural development or mental growth of a nation. This, which at the time seems self-evident, is unfortunately easy to overlook in the perspectives of history, for the cultural ruins may be hidden or overshadowed by the political and economic devastation.

The years immediately preceding the War will be remembered as a period of remarkable progress in Russia's social and economic history. A wave of enthusiasm was running high, sweeping over Government, law-makers, and indeed the entire country. The State, the Duma, and the zemstvos were showing a deep interest in questions of education, and, by a series of measures, recounted in the present monographs, were making ready the way for a new era in the story of Russian schools. In this they had the whole-hearted support of the teaching world; and it spared itself no pains to arrive at the best methods of dealing with the problem.

The early stages of the world struggle united the whole country in a common effort to resist the invading enemy; and, for the time, Russia put all else behind her. Nevertheless, as Professor Novgorotsev points out, the most acute minds did not fail to realize that even in those first days of the War the country's efforts ought to be directed not only toward meeting immediate demands of the War, but also toward preparing for the vast constructive tasks

Russia would have to face with the return of peace. It was my privilege, as Minister of Education, to set in motion the work of reorganizing the whole Russian school system which is so adequately described in this volume; and, in spite of the immense difficulties in its way, it was courageously carried out. Naturally it was a plan of reorganization that had to be curtailed in view of the situation at the time it was presented, and more time had to be allowed for the working out of its various details. Indeed, the difficulty of putting the new school system in operation under war-time conditions was overwhelming. A cutting down of appropriations coupled with the increase in the cost of living made any additions to school courses all but impossible. Allowances for the maintenance of schools, insufficient even before the War, were reduced to almost negligible sums by the rapid depreciation of the ruble. No granting of a war bonus enabled teachers' salaries to keep pace with rising prices and meet the bare necessities even of the unmarried, while, in point of fact, the great majority of teachers had families to provide for. An imperfect Conscription Law, which did not exempt teachers in elementary schools, deprived these schools of their trained leaders, and made it very hard to keep teaching and school work even up to the pre-war standard. I must also speak of the difficulties which arose from the fact that many schools had to be moved from the war zone, and of the extremely hard conditions under which war-zone refugees had to live; conditions which naturally interfered with the education of school children. Intense as were Russian feeling and enthusiasm at the beginning of the War, it was inevitable that the ceaseless pressure of the long-drawn out struggle should in the end weaken and break them down. The reorganization of Russia's schools was given a set-back—and it was a great set-back—that was due to psychological factors and to economic conditions, working together.

That more time would have to be allowed for such a reorganization, even if the War ended victoriously, could likewise and easily be foreseen. The heavy economic losses suffered by the schools, their damage or destruction in the war zone, their requisition as hospitals and the like, with their consequent loss of equipment and libraries, seriously handicapped the progress of reform. The ranks of the teaching staffs had suffered great losses; while the attempts of the Government to fill such gaps by opening new Teachers' Colleges were, as M. Odinetz points out, utterly inadequate. And even now,

ten years after the end of the War, the wounds that Russian education received in it have not been healed.

To preserve a minimum staff of educational workers was not the only task that was laid upon the Ministry of Education. It was no less important to save, and to keep open and actively at work, those educational institutions, in areas near the front, which the mischances of war had driven into the interior. For year after year the Ministry had to ask of its workers efforts that were often almost superhuman, if those in control were to meet the call of duty in a manner worthy of those who were giving all they had for their country. But could such efforts or any resolutions prevail against the crude facts of war? Of necessity what was hard became ever harder. Education was crippled, and with it the work of years.

To what has been here written by Professor Novgorotsev and M. Odinetz I will venture to add a few words of explanation which, possibly, may make even clearer to the reader how great was the educational effort which was made in Russia.

From the standpoint of popular education the civilized world looked upon Russia as a backward country. At the same time it had to admit that she had given it not a few who ranked with the greatest—Pushkin and Dostoevsky, Tolstoi, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky, Mendelev, Metchnikov, Pavlov, and others. But, between these and the masses of the ignorant, the contrast was striking indeed.

What was the reason for this? Most probably, the insufficient number of primary schools. But there were many educational leaders in Russia who believed that a no less vital reason lay in the scholastic, the one-sidedly classical character of the education given in Russian schools. Its detachment from the actualities of life and from the practical interests of the people, its tendency to develop a propensity for abstract thought rather than the realities of ordinary life made people in general lukewarm to it, and the peasantry regarded it with no confidence whatever. I recall the words of a peasant member of one of the zemstvos: "If you are going to multiply the sort of schools you have now," he said, "you will be able to get all the clerks you want for fifty copecks a day. But three rubles won't get you a single laborer." The secondary schools were filled with the same zest for abstraction. More than that, in their courses there was nothing that was rounded out and conclusive, for their sole aim was to prepare matriculants for the universities. But only a minority of high-school

students went on to the universities. The rest were launched into the realities of life without any training that was really basic, and wholly unprepared for whatever work might be awaiting them. Practical knowledge was held to be knowledge of an inferior order. The view of the human mind which was held by the schools led them to ignore, or at any rate to underestimate, everything but the capacity of the pupil for abstract thinking, and to leave the other sides of his nature untrained and undeveloped. There is only one educational system that can meet the needs of life, satisfy the demands of the people, and at the same time fulfil the dictates of education in every sense of the word. That is a school system which can minister equally to every phase of our human desire to acquire knowledge—knowledge that is concrete and practical as well as abstract—and look without bias upon all human achievements.

The zemstvos were eager and anxious to carry out reforms in the schools under their control. Again and again, at conventions of primary teachers, the finger was laid upon the defects of the existing system, and the unhappy fruit it bore. But the Government paid no heed until 1909; and then the Department which first took up the matter was the Ministry of Agriculture.

This was because the Ministry of Agriculture found itself closest to the interests of the tiller of the soil. When working with the local zemstvos to raise the standards of agriculture, it was brought face to face with the question of what manner of education the masses should be given. Schools which could give no light and help to their pupils, in regard to those things which, for the majority of them, were of direct concern in the earning of their daily bread, seemed to offer very little. Indeed, even in the rare cases where children were given the desire for further knowledge, the sole result was to encourage them to leave the country and go to the cities which alone could supply the kind of education they sought. Thus good brains were lost to intelligent farming; and to the number of Russia's "book learners" and abstract thinkers, of whom she already had too many, there were added just so many more. As for agriculture, one of the country's vital interests, if not its most vital, the business of helping the farmer, and making his output larger and more profitable was handicapped by the fact that among the educated who lived in the country there were almost none who had been given any of that knowledge of "higher farming" which might have enabled them to

pass on new and progressive ideas to those around them who had had no such opportunities. The Ministry of Agriculture hoped to find in the primary schools the medium through which it could really do its work; and it was very natural that it should be so.

At the beginning, however, it met with much opposition, and from members of the Duma. Some of them, strong supporters of things as they were, indulged in heated protests. When the bill that would make possible the proposed reforms was introduced in the Duma, they saw in it a desire on the part of its authors to turn the schools into vocational schools and give them over to the specialists. That, of course, the Ministry of Agriculture had no thought of doing. Its aim was a simple one. It planned to offer the education of reality. It could call upon those who were experts in things essential to the great majority of Russia's population, to 85 per cent of it. And it desired to be able to carry that expert knowledge directly to teacher and pupil. Indeed, in the end, it was the staunch support, in the committee stage, given by the peasant members of the Duma, that made it possible to put this program through.

Let me mention one thing which had a large part in deciding the Ministry of Agriculture to adopt it. It was a book sent home by a Russian emigrant in California. This was a volume bearing some such title as "School and Society," or "School and the Home," which made as its basic principle the theory that the school must make itself part and parcel of the child's surroundings, and in that way open the book of life to him. This showed me that almost the selfsame ideas that I have been outlining above had been growing up in America. And the friend of education on the other side of the ocean who sent us that book had given us the greatest help and encouragement to go on and try to plant the same ideas in the soil of Russia. Being at that time Chairman of the Board of Agriculture, I had the book translated and widely distributed among my assistants throughout the country; and in their case, too, it helped much to spur them on to new efforts in behalf of our tillers of the soil to whom they were devoting themselves.

The War came. It laid a heavy hand on the progress of education in Russia. But the work that had been undertaken was carried on, and with all the powers of those who had undertaken it. In 1915 and 1916 the principles adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture received, unreservedly, the adherence of the Ministry of Education, and it

was decided to carry them out. They were embodied in a new bill, which made it its aim to bring Russia's whole school system into closer relation with the practical needs of the country, and at the same time to try to bring out all the latent capacity of the child. More specifically, its provisions were as follows:

The unifying of all schools, of whatsoever grades, into a single system, each grade taking up and carrying on the work of the one before it; but at the same time the introduction of a system of main study groups which in turn were subdivided into more definite subjects. The individual capacity of every child, and his possible inclination for one kind of study rather than the other, was taken into account. Moreover, every study group was also to be self-sufficient and capable of offering the pupil an education of some definite kind, so that those who could go only so far in their schooling could at least leave school with a store of knowledge that was both useful and, in a way, complete.

The use of the child's native tongue or dialect should predominate in the lower grades. This measure was also designed to bring the school into closer contact with the actual life of the pupil. Later on, by a gradual introduction of the official language of the State, the child was to be brought by degrees into a closer relation with the cultural, political, and economic development of the country at large.

Accompanying and paralleling the schools of general character, there should be professional and technical schools, so that every pupil should have the best possible chance of finding the course best suited to his inclinations and capacity, and also so that the State should be provided with the necessary number of workers possessing special qualifications. This branching out, or specializing, began with the third grade, for any special aptitudes in a child commonly make themselves known somewhere between the ages of fourteen and sixteen.

Important above all, however, was the abandonment of the prevailing belief that the *genus homo* can be given his true development only by that kind of education which is classical, or abstract. In attitude and method these new schools were returning to the old Russian point of view, from which Russian educational ideas had departed in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

A few words more as to the position of the universities under the new system. Professor Novgorotsev is right when he says that it was

a tradition in Russia to regard the universities as the real temples of learning, that is, of abstract learning. This found its expression in a willingness to leave the universities very largely to control their own affairs. But, both under the pressure of the Government and above all because of the demands of actual life, the universities had had by degrees to undertake the business of preparing young men for professional and technical careers. As the State, and society itself, progressively developed, the need of capable specialists made itself felt more and more. The lack of schools specially qualified to produce such specialists, or rather the inadequate number of such schools, made it necessary for the various departments of the Government to demand of university graduates who were entering any branch of government service that they should be possessed of certain and requisite special knowledge. This compelled the universities, in their turn, to organize special classes in which their students could equip themselves to meet such demands. But when they did so, the universities allowed outside factors to enter in and deprive them of their status of complete self-government. To preserve this for them, the Ministry of Education, when introducing a new educational measure in 1916, decided so to arrange it that the universities, as such, should be left to the pursuit of knowledge and the task of instruction in the traditional and accepted fields; students should be taught the methods of scientific research, but only for the furtherance of scientific discovery and the increase of knowledge. Under such conditions no interference from outside the universities could be called for, and all objections to their being again left free to govern themselves were swept away.

But the country's undoubted need of specialists had to be met. To do that the Ministry of Education decided that, side by side with the universities, there should be established those needed technical and professional colleges that would produce the specialists required. In them university graduates and undergraduates could take the necessary special courses requisite for government service; and the various government departments interested should have a right to make themselves felt when it was a question of deciding what those special courses should be. Thus while their freedom was preserved to the universities, the country's needs were met, and higher learning likewise brought more closely into touch with actual life. Thus the reform was inaugurated which was to readjust the educational policy of

Russia, outside of the universities, to the realities of the lives of its citizens. But there were other facts to reckon with at the moment of its trial,—the grim realities of war, first with a foreign foe, and then civil war within the State itself. In 1917 the wave of revolution broke over the country, and most of its old-time institutions were carried away.

With the tragic events of later years we have not to deal in this History. New ways of life are taking form; but man still lives in the need of light and in the end the light of truth will prevail. In spite of all discouragement one can still cherish the faith that mankind itself will yet demand that kind of education which can give all the manifold complexities of nature their complete development. These are ideals. But the time will come when, freed from the changing influences of political doctrines and control, once more they will give guidance to all that is best in the country in the sacred task of lighting the way of Truth and Peace and Love.

At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the War, and the chaos that has followed it, have for the present at least, meant disaster for the work of education in Russia. The plan to cover Russia with a network of primary schools by 1920, and to make compulsory a few years later the primary education of every child of seven,—this great scheme of national education has not been realized. Had there been no war, what would Russia be today? The pages which follow will raise this question in the mind of every thoughtful reader. It is a question, however, to which history has no reply.

Count Paul N. Ignatiev.

I

RUSSIAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS PRIOR TO AND DURING THE WAR

By DIMITRY M. ODINETZ

CHAPTER I

THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS BEFORE THE WAR

When the Great War broke out, elementary and secondary schools in Russia had reached a turning point in their development, and marked progress had been made in their organization.

The still unstable outward forms of school life, however, and the as yet undetermined tendencies of school development were to be put to a severe test by the events that ensued.

1. *Primary Schools in 1914.*

In 1914 the primary schools were divided according to their curricula and the periods of instruction into one-class schools, two-class schools, and lower primary (reading and writing) schools.

In the one-class schools, the former three years' course of instruction had now in most cases been prolonged to four years. In addition to reading and writing, pupils were instructed in the rudiments of religion, the Russian language, history, geography, arithmetic, and nature study.

The program of studies of the two-class schools included in addition the elements of geometry, physics, zoölogy, and hygiene; by 1914, the course of studies in the majority of these schools had been prolonged from five to six years.

Besides these there existed four-class upper primary schools with a four years' course. Of these schools some had been opened recently in conformity with the law of July 28, 1912, and some, in virtue of the same law, had been reorganized from the former municipal four-class schools which were the outcome of the law of 1872. The final reorganization of the municipal schools into upper primary schools was to be completed by July 1915. Strictly speaking, the upper primary schools did not belong to the class of purely elementary schools. They represented an intermediate type between the lower and the secondary school, without, however, being a transition stage toward the latter. The object of the upper primary schools was to provide a complete elementary education.

The vast majority of the elementary schools were opened by self-governing zemstvo and municipal bodies, by the Ministry of Education, and, lastly, by the Holy Synod. There were also schools founded by other departments or by private individuals, but the total number of these was insignificant in comparison with the first group.

From the middle of the 'seventies of the last century, when the organs of local government became conscious of the overwhelming national importance of elementary education and recognized that they were themselves called upon to be the chief promoters and organizers of a system of primary schools, the number of zemstvo schools began rapidly to outstrip that of other types of primary schools and to enlist more and more the sympathies of the public.

A census taken in 1880 of all the primary schools in the sixty provinces of European Russia showed their total number to be 22,770. In the zemstvo provinces[1] 70 per cent of the schools were supported by the zemstvos, 15 per cent by rural communities, while the remaining 15 per cent were composed mainly of private schools and of schools maintained by the Ministry of Education. Already at this date the expenditure incurred by the zemstvos for the needs of primary education exceeded the sums allotted by the State Treasury for the support of primary schools throughout the Empire. Thus, in 1880, the expenditure by the State Treasury for this purpose amounted to 1,680,126 rubles,[2] whereas that of the zemstvos was 1,440,000 rubles. In 1891, the expenditure of the zemstvos on elementary schools had increased to 5,307,000 rubles, while that of the State was only 1,480,397. The reports of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod and of the Minister of Education show that toward 1900 "82 per cent of the total outlay on elementary schools was met by local government institutions, about 14 per cent by the State Treasury, and about 2 per cent by the Church and other ecclesiastical organizations." A year previous to the introduction of universal elementary education, in 1907, the total figure of the expenditure of the zemstvos on schools amounted to 26,200,000 rubles (21 per cent of the total zemstvos' budget); in 1910 it amounted to 42,400,000 rubles; and in 1918 to over 60 million rubles.

Simultaneously with the growing apportionment on the organization and development of the network of primary schools, the zemstvos

[1] Provinces enjoying the privileges of local government.

[2] One ruble = 2s. 1d.

began to introduce various coördinated measures tending toward a general improvement of national elementary education.

From the 'nineties of the last century onward, the zemstvo schools were gradually established on a firmer basis; proper school buildings were provided; libraries and adequate school equipment supplied. The three years' course of studies of the one-class schools was gradually prolonged to four years. In order to raise the standard of the educational staff, the zemstvos on their own initiative began to organize teachers' conferences and to open training schools for teachers. Finally, the zemstvos appeared as the pioneers, in the full sense of the word, of an important branch of education, namely, that of evening (or other special) classes for adults. As was noted in the debates of the third State Duma, Russia was perhaps the only country in which it was necessary to combat not only illiteracy, but also a "return to illiteracy." The steps taken by the zemstvos in creating educational centers for the adult population, in order to overcome this evil, were, therefore, of the utmost value.

Of all the various types of primary schools, that of the one-class school remained to the last the chief object of the zemstvos' solicitude. The lower elementary schools were, from 1891 onward, placed by the Government entirely under the control of the church authorities. On the other hand, until the beginning of 1906, the zemstvos were not empowered to open two-class schools, which provided a somewhat advanced primary education. Nevertheless, the zemstvos contributed indirectly to the foundation of upper primary schools by substantial monetary grants to the so-called model government schools. Down to the 'nineties, moreover, the zemstvos rendered considerable financial assistance to the parish schools; but these subsidies were subsequently almost entirely withdrawn, as in the opinion of the zemstvos, the parish schools fell short of the required educational standard.

The first two-class zemstvo schools appeared only after 1906, when the zemstvos were at last given permission to open schools of this class. By the law of July 1, 1914,[3] on the subject of private schools, the zemstvos were granted wider opportunities for developing various types of schools of a higher educational standard. Nevertheless, they still kept mainly to the old one-class type of school, and

[3] All dates in this monograph are given in accordance with the Russian calendar.

the number of newly established two-class schools remained far below the rapidly growing demands of the population.

The slow development of the system of two-class schools cannot be explained by a failure on the part of the zemstvos to recognize their importance. On the contrary, in the years immediately preceding the War, the members of most of the district zemstvo sessions evinced keen interest in such schools.

During the first five years from the time when the zemstvos were authorized to open two-class schools, the number created by them considerably surpassed the total of those of a similar type founded by the Ministry of Education. Scarcity of funds, however, due to the legal limit on their powers of taxation, precluded zemstvos from developing simultaneously both one- and two-class schools, and forced them to defer the latter.

By 1914 the primary schools founded by the Department of Education in conformity with the law of 1875 were completely swamped in the mass of the zemstvo schools. In official reports the government schools were referred to as model schools. But there was nothing in them to justify this description. The period of instruction in those schools was usually shorter than in the zemstvo schools. Moreover, as was frequently remarked by the writers on educational matters, the government schools by laying too great a stress on formal subjects and reducing the schedule of studies mainly to grammar and spelling, "failed to attain the desired standard of an adequate all-round education, and to occupy their proper and influential place in the life of the nation." More important was the part played by the Ministry of Education with regard to the upper primary schools. The majority of those existing in 1914 were founded by the Ministry. In any case, all the upper primary schools, whether government, public, or private, were under the direct control of the Ministry, or, to quote the somewhat complicated formula of the law of June 25, 1912, "under the control of the curator of the educational district, the immediate administration of the director of elementary schools, and the direct supervision of the inspector of elementary schools."

By the law of June 25, 1912, the upper primary schools were organized in such a manner as to place, so to speak, a barrier between the primary and the secondary schools. Although those pupils of the upper primary schools who had successfully completed the work of their first and second classes were entitled by the law to join the sec-

ond or third classes of secondary schools, it was only "on condition of passing an examination in the classical and modern languages required by the school which the candidates wish to enter." The third and fourth form pupils of the upper primary schools were deprived even of that relative privilege, because the course of studies of those forms differed substantially from that of the secondary schools. Consequently the law of 1912 merely completed the organization of schools, but did not combine elementary and secondary education into one system. In practice, however, the upper primary schools were unable to fulfil, on any large scale, their first and fundamental task—that of providing their pupils with a complete all-round elementary education. In the first place, fees were charged at the State upper primary schools. In the second place, the number of upper primary and of former municipal schools was so insignificant, that according to official statistics, only one such school existed per 135,000 of the population. As a result, the needs of the population for that particular type of school remained largely unsatisfied. Finally, the church or parish schools, as they existed in 1914, were, on the average, considerably below the standard both of the zemstvo and of the State schools. In this respect the evolution of the church primary school was exactly the reverse of that of the zemstvo school. For a long time the church schools enjoyed the special patronage of the Government and were zealously recommended as a counterpoise to the zemstvo schools. In the 'eighties of the last century the question of placing all the primary schools under the entire control of the Holy Synod was more than once considered.

Nevertheless, with the increasing development of the zemstvo schools the church primary schools became of less and less importance as factors in national education. This applies in equal measure to the one-class and two-class church schools, and to the lower primary "reading and writing" schools. The course of instruction in the church schools did not exceed three years in the one-class, and four years in the two-class schools. The equipment of these schools, their libraries, etc., as well as the buildings themselves were exceedingly poor. Inquiries carried out among the elementary school teaching staff revealed that from the economic point of view, the parish school-teacher was the most underpaid member of the teaching profession; while his educational level and special training were, as a rule, considerably below those of the teacher in State and zemstvo

schools. All these causes contributed to this result, that, while the teaching staff were far below a proper standard in all the elementary schools, they were particularly so in the parish schools. As regards the "reading and writing" schools, these, as was not infrequently pointed out in the press, sometimes existed merely on paper.

It follows that in the most favorable conditions, the church schools were but an inferior imitation of the zemstvo schools. It is therefore not to be wondered at that of all the primary schools the zemstvo school should stand first and foremost, and that in popular parlance the terms "primary school" and "zemstvo school" should become synonymous.

The introduction in Russia of universal primary education which was begun in the years immediately preceding the War was calculated to increase still further the importance of the zemstvos in the sphere of national education.

This idea of universal primary education had found its advocates long before among the zemstvo workers, who, as far back as the late 'sixties and early 'seventies of the last century, had presented over twenty petitions to the Government in favor of it. In the 'nineties, the zemstvos passed to the practical realization of the scheme for universal education, organized special statistical research, and worked out plans for a primary-school system in accordance with the needs of the population. As political conditions prohibited combined action on the part of the zemstvos, the activities of the separate district zemstvos appeared disconnected not only in their details but occasionally even in their main principles. Notwithstanding these obstacles, even the isolated endeavors of individual district zemstvos did not fail to bear fruit. These efforts resulted not merely in a rapid and decisive increase in the number of zemstvo primary schools; they also contributed in no small degree to move the Ministry of Education to abandon that state of inertia in the matter of elementary education in which it had persisted since 1860. The change in the educational policy of the Ministry was likewise due to the influence of general events in Russia in 1905-1906, and to the mere fact of the existence of the State Duma.

From the time when in 1906 the Ministry of Education set about the elaboration of a scheme for the rapid development of universal education, the whole question entered on a new phase, which pre-

sented marked features both of a favorable and of an unfavorable character.

The Ministry did not consider it expedient to invite representatives of the local government to coöperate in drawing up the scheme of universal education. As a result of this omission the government plan proved too theoretical and showed a lack of due consideration for local educational conditions and requirements. The whole of Russia was subjected to a uniform school system. Both the zemstvo and the Duma drew attention to the need for important amendments designed to meet local conditions, but without result.

Besides being unduly academic, the government scheme suffered to a still greater degree from incompleteness. The first All-Russian congress of primary school-teachers which met at the end of 1913 insisted "that the scheme for universal education must have as its basis an organic law dealing with the elementary school, its aim and program of studies, and the bodies to be charged with the control of primary education." Similar views found frequent expression both in the general press and in special educational periodicals. The Ministry, however, paid no heed to them, and the initiative in drawing up an "organic" bill on education was taken by the State Duma.

To educational workers, again, the important question how far it was desirable and expedient to build up the structure of universal education mainly on government subsidies remained open to argument. The traditions and experience of the zemstvos had taught them to regard with some apprehension the idea of government grants for educational purposes, lest they should thereby forfeit still more of their independence, already seriously restricted by existing regulations. Meanwhile, the scheme for introducing universal primary education was based not on the adequate organization of zemstvo finance, *i.e.*, on an amendment of the law limiting the zemstvo's powers of taxation, but on the grant of special sums from the Treasury. This fact gave rise to the fear of increased government pressure on the primary schools.

Nevertheless all doubts raised by the ministerial scheme for universal education were allayed by the possibility of a speedy realization of the cherished dream of Russian educators. Without exaggerating the importance of the ministerial scheme, the zemstvos and the general public overcame their scruples in the expectation that practical experience and the subsequent course of events would

inevitably lead to urgent and fundamental amendments in the original plan. The State Duma, while recognizing the importance of combining all the schemes for universal education in a single organic law, did not judge it possible, in view of the urgency of the matter, to wait till the general bill on primary schools should pass all its readings and receive final sanction. It accordingly inaugurated a series of new laws on universal primary education, by assigning yearly grants for primary schools.

The first law of this series was confirmed on May 3, 1908. The fundamental provisions of this and subsequent acts were as follows: All children of either sex between the ages of eight and eleven are to receive primary education; the course of instruction in primary schools to be four years; the average normal school radius to be three versts (two miles); the period of time assigned for introducing universal education to be ten years; one teacher to be appointed for every fifty children. A teacher's minimum wage was to be reckoned at 360 rubles a year, that of a teacher of religion 60 rubles a year; increases of salary of 60 rubles in five-year periods to bring the maximum salary of a teacher after twenty years' service to 600 rubles a year. A school included in the above system should provide instruction for children free of charge, and should be housed in premises answering the demands of school hygiene, and be supplied with textbooks and all school equipment.

After undergoing certain alterations, the final financial scheme for introducing universal education may be broadly outlined as follows: Each newly opened or existing complete school unit included in the system of universal education was to receive from the State Treasury a sum of 420 rubles a year for payment of the teacher's salary, and in addition a sum required for payment of the five-year salary increase. For the purchase of school furniture, equipment, etc., each school received a single subsidy from the Treasury normally to the amount of from 200 to 250 rubles, which sum in any case was not to exceed 700 rubles. All other expenses for the equipment and maintenance of the schools were provided from local funds. The zemstvos, towns, and rural communes provided for the maintenance of the premises of both their own and the government schools. In accepting subsidies, the organs of local government undertook the obligation of opening a specified number of new schools, and of adding, according

to the financial scheme, a certain number of complete units in the schools already existing.

Besides the financial assistance mentioned above, the local government bodies, or in places where they did not exist, the village communities, received special loans for school buildings from a special school fund, named after Peter the Great, for a term not exceeding forty years and for an amount not exceeding four-fifths of the value of the building, at a yearly interest of 3 per cent; or a subsidy not exceeding one-half of the value of the building and in any case not exceeding 2,000 rubles for a stone building and 1,500 rubles for a wooden building.

In spite of all the endeavors of the Duma, the separate laws on universal education were never combined in a single legislative act. The bill for this purpose, read a second time by the Duma in 1911, was rejected by the State Council.

As a monument to the legislative work of the Third Duma, this measure certainly deserves notice. By it, the task of national primary education was handed over to the zemstvos and municipal self-governing bodies and the church parish schools were removed from their isolated position. To the Ministry was assigned merely the duty of general guidance and official supervision. In districts where a non-Russian population was predominant, the act authorized schools with a four years' course to give instruction in the mother tongue of the pupils. Moreover, by this bill the vital problem of a uniform school, which had been so long under discussion in the educational press, was solved in a positive sense. According to the proposed measure, the upper primary schools were to serve as a connecting link between the lower primary schools and the secondary schools. The bill, as drawn up by the Duma, was moreover exceedingly beneficial in that it offered abundant opportunities for adapting the schools to the peculiar conditions prevailing in any given locality, lessening the delays caused by unnecessary formalities, or abolishing them altogether, and encouraging local agencies to take part in school conferences, and so forth.

The State Council rejected nearly all the principal provisions of the Duma bill. It refused to acquiesce in abolishing the isolation of the church schools, ruled out the section concerning instruction in the mother tongue in primary schools for non-Russian children, and displayed a marked lack of confidence in the organs of local government

and a pointed tendency to increase the influence not merely of the school authorities, but of the government generally on national education. The State Council likewise introduced a radical amendment in the status of the upper primary schools as conceived by the Duma, by rejecting the section concerning the unbroken sequence between primary and secondary education.

The increase, however, in the number of primary schools was not hampered by the failure of the School Act. On the strength of special laws providing for the payment of separate yearly subsidies for schools, the Ministry continued to enter into separate agreements with individual zemstvos and municipalities, thereby carrying forward its scheme for universal primary education. On the other hand, the municipalities and zemstvos adopted the schemes and plans of the government school system, built and opened new schools, appointed a time limit for introducing universal education within their respective areas and, contrary to their traditional policy, readily accepted the credits advanced by the Government. The Duma, in spite of the conflict with the State Council, nevertheless continued to acquiesce in what it regarded as a compromise, since it fully realized the necessity of a rapid development in the matter of universal education.

According to the final estimate of the Duma School Committee, the total number of children of school age in 1922—the date by which the system of universal education was to be completed—would be 15,852,000. About 317,000 school units were required to provide for their education. Toward 1908, when the scheme of universal education was first introduced, there existed somewhat less than 100,000 schools. In the years 1908 to 1914, this number was increased by 49,458, thus giving an average yearly increase of over 8,000 schools. This comparatively small increase, having regard to the sums assigned—usually amounting to 9 or 10 million rubles per annum, is explained by the fact that the earlier grants were mainly utilized not so much for the opening of new school units, as for salaries of the teaching staff and for the purchase of equipment for the schools already existing. Thus in 1914 the total number of schools was due to reach a total of 149,458, with an approximate total number of 7,478,000 pupils. There were wanting therefore nearly 167,542 schools in order to reach the number required to complete

the system of universal education. This deficit remained to be made up in the ensuing nine years.

By 1914, the Ministry of Education had come to an understanding with 386 district zemstvos (out of 426) and with 257 municipalities concerning universal education. In the zemstvo provinces[4] the number of newly opened school units was 6,139 in 1909, 6,198 in 1910, 7,180 in 1911, 7,380 in 1912, and 7,445 in 1913. In most of those districts not enjoying the zemstvo local government, the year 1913 saw only the beginning of the work of planning the school system and its financial basis.

In the absence of precise data it is impossible to estimate the ratio of the one-class and two-class schools to the total of the newly opened schools; but in any case, and according to the information available, it may be confidently asserted that the zemstvos, in carrying out the scheme of universal education, were primarily concerned with opening one-class schools. According to the figures of the school census of 1911, there existed districts in Russia where the total of two-class schools of all kinds did not exceed two or three.

The financial side of the scheme for introducing universal education was not calculated to raise serious apprehensions. It was a matter of certainty that the Treasury would be able to bear the burden of the outlay for the gradual development of universal primary education. This view received authoritative confirmation in the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance, Count Kokovzov, before the State Council in 1912, in which he stated, "Our budget shows a yearly increase of ordinary state revenues, without increase from new taxation, of 3 or 4 per cent. In the first year, the 10 million rubles assigned as the yearly increase in the grants for promoting universal education represent 0.33 per cent of the sum of 2,950 million rubles which form the gross total of national expenditure. Within ten years, these 10 millions will become 100 millions a year, that is, 2.6 per cent of the total national expenditure. The increased expenditure would thus be compensated by the increase in the national revenues."

As regards the upper primary schools, which were not included in the system of universal education, they continued to exist in 1914 under extremely unfavorable conditions. In later years their number was somewhat increased. Sixty-three new schools were opened by the

[4] *See* p. 4, n. 1.

Ministry in 1911, 43 in 1912, and 74 in 1913. In 1914 their total number was 1,339 (of these 74 were founded by local funds). According to government statistics for 1912, on an average one such school existed for every 135,000 inhabitants and for every 139 primary-school units. In 1914, owing to the rapid increase of the population and the considerable development of primary schools, this ratio could no longer be assumed to hold good. In the absence of a coordinated plan for the foundation of new upper primary schools, those actually in existence did not prove as useful as they would have been, had their numerical increase been carried out according to a prearranged scheme.

Meantime there was naturally a continuous growth in the demand for such schools, especially in view of the development of universal education. There was marked evidence of this in the ever increasing number of petitions for the opening of higher primary schools. One hundred and sixty-nine such petitions were presented in 1911, 215 in 1912, 329 in 1913, and 428 in 1914. Out of these 1,141 petitions, 715 were recognized as urgent by the district educational authorities, but only 229 upper primary schools were in fact opened during that period.

With the increase of primary schools the question of the provision of an adequate teaching staff became extremely acute, as well as that of their training and proper economic and legal status.

In 1910, according to the estimates of the Moscow Society for the Propagation of Education (*Moskovskoe Obshchestvo Gramotnosti*), the realization of universal education within a period of ten years would demand an annual supply of 23,000 primary school-teachers. The report of the State Duma Committee pointed out the necessity of providing for the training of 171,918 teachers during the next ten years.

As early as the 'seventies of the nineteenth century the zemstvos had founded several colleges for the training of school-teachers, but subsequently this task was almost entirely taken over by the Ministry of Education.

In 1914, there existed in Russia only 119 training colleges (seminaries for men teachers), of which 112 were maintained by the State and 7 by municipalities and zemstvos, and 8 normal schools, of which 5 were government schools and 3 private. Of the 119 training colleges, about one-half were opened after the introduction of universal

primary education, that is to say, 6 in 1908, 7 in 1909, 6 in 1910, 6 in 1911, 14 in 1912, and 15 in 1913. According to official statistics 2,290 persons graduated by 1914 from these establishments. The yearly average of pupils graduating from each of these teacher-training institutions was 20.

On the other hand, as has already been pointed out, the number of newly opened school units for the same year amounted to 7,445 in the zemstvo provinces alone. The total number of young men who left the training colleges was therefore insufficient to fill the vacancies even in the newly opened schools, to say nothing of those occasioned by the ordinary depletion in the staff already in existence.

As auxiliary training centers for the teaching staff, the Ministry of Education opened special two or three year permanent courses for teachers in those localities where the shortage of teachers was most acute. However, at the best of times, these courses could provide annually not more than 1,000 teachers. The absence of qualified teachers compelled the school administration to fill the vacancies with candidates lacking adequate general and educational training, that is, persons who had received home or primary education, or at best with women teachers who had passed through the diocesan schools or the eighth pedagogical class of the girls' secondary schools (*gymnasia*) where the training as teachers was purely nominal.

Only in the Petrograd educational district were the majority of the primary school-teachers well qualified. The state of affairs in other districts was generally deplorable. According to the school census of 1911, in the Kiev educational district, which was typical in respect of the state of primary education, out of 9,602 men and 7,041 women school-teachers who sent in replies to the inquiry submitted to them, 80.8 per cent of the men and 28 per cent of the women had received primary or home education, while 60 per cent of the women teachers were educated in diocesan schools and the eighth-class gymnasia for girls.

Such was the state of affairs in the zemstvo schools. In the parish primary schools the number of teachers who had received special training did not exceed 2 per cent.

Many school-teachers, to whom life in the country was a novel experience, looked upon their present occupation as of a casual and temporary nature. Devoid of adequate training, unfamiliar with his surroundings, and inclined to look upon his work as a stepping-stone

to something better, the village schoolmaster was incapable not merely of educating the younger generation, but also of satisfying the countryside's demands for enlightenment, and so failed to become an influential social worker in the district that fate had assigned to him.

It is of course impossible to deny the existence of a select minority among the teaching staff of the primary schools, which upheld the tradition of the primary teacher, whose work to him was a religious calling. This minority worked vigorously in the sphere which was dear to it, was keenly interested in new methods of education and instruction, kept in close touch with the writings of the educational periodicals, and expressed an ardent desire for educational literature and for further training. These young men and women also acquired marked influence on the community in which they lived. They, however, formed only a minority, whose merit was all the greater, the more conspicuously they stood out against the drab background of the rank and file of the school workers.

On January 1, 1914, there existed in Russia 32 training colleges for teachers in the upper primary schools. According to information provided by the Ministry of Education for 1913, 427 graduated from sixteen colleges, thus giving an average of 26 each. The number of municipal and upper primary schools at the time was 1,387, employing an aggregate of 5,600 men and women teachers. Assuming the annual loss in the teaching staff from natural causes to be 10 per cent, we find that the total number of candidates provided by the training colleges in 1914 was insufficient to fill these vacancies, to say nothing of those upper primary schools which were being newly opened. Moreover the Act of June 25, 1912, set up a definite educational standard for teachers in the upper primary schools. A considerable number of the teaching staff of the four-class municipal schools, about 40 per cent, did not come up to the required standard and should therefore have been replaced.

The economic and legal status of the primary school-teacher was moreover far from satisfactory. The law on universal education fixed the initial salary of the village school-teacher at 30 rubles a month. After each period of five years he received a monthly increment of 5 rubles, which raised his salary to a maximum of 50 rubles a month after twenty years' service. As compared to pre-reform times this was an improvement; but it was not a living wage, especially for a mar-

ried man with a family. According to detailed estimates frequently quoted in pedagogical publications, the initial salary of a primary school-teacher was insufficient to cover even the cost of food, which in a small family would amount to about 370 rubles a year. A village school-teacher was generally provided with lodgings, heat, and light. In town and city school-teachers were frequently deprived even of these privileges, and were compelled to rent apartments somewhere on the outskirts of the town. Besides board and lodging the school-teacher was obliged to incur expenses for clothes, household requirements, education for his children, deductions for the pension fund, sick list, sundries, etc. Intellectual needs, such as the purchase of books, subscriptions to periodicals, traveling expenses to attend lectures and courses, educational excursions, journeys to town, entailed further expense and these items were all the more necessary, as without such intellectual stimulus the schoolmaster's efficiency would suffer.

Under such conditions the school-teacher found himself compelled not only to employ all his spare time in doing outside work, but occasionally to steal time from precious school hours in order to earn a few extra rubles.

A plot of land of from two to five acres was sometimes, though not often, attached to the school. But it is to be noted that when a schoolmaster starts a vegetable garden, fruit-growing, or bee-keeping, and buys more land, these rapidly become his principal interests, and the school is relegated to the background. The majority of school-teachers were compelled to take private pupils, which were very difficult to find in the country, or to take positions during their holiday. In the province of Kursk, for instance, the parish school-teachers often became caretakers or porters in various zemstvo establishments for the summer months. The whole standard of teaching could not but suffer from the poverty of the teacher's physical and intellectual surroundings. A teacher receiving less than a living wage was not only unable to enlarge his knowledge but even ran the risk of losing whatever knowledge he possessed. Again, the spirit of a school, the teacher of which was both mentally and physically depressed, was necessarily low; and such a school was shunned by the pupils. Whereas a school where the teacher was able to give his whole heart and time to his task would always be well attended.

The low salary of the school-teacher was the cause of another grave

evil. Even men who had completed their training in a training college for teachers frequently looked upon their profession as temporary and endeavored to find other work. Many teachers exchanged their profession for the church, where they served as deacons or readers, because a church-reader was economically in a better position than a primary school-teacher. This led to great restlessness and change among the teaching staff. According to the school census of 1911 in the Kiev educational district 41.6 per cent of men and 49.6 per cent of women teachers remained at their post for less than five years, and only 6.6 per cent of the men and 6.2 per cent of the women teachers had taught in the same school for as long as fifteen years. The figures obtained by the Smolensk provincial zemstvo board show that of the total number of zemstvo school-teachers (1,503) in the school year 1911-1912, 35.9 per cent remained in the same school only one year, 42.6 per cent between two and five years, 12.3 per cent ten years, and 9.1 per cent over ten years. Among the women teachers in the province of Smolensk, the duration of service was slightly below that of the men.

This lack of financial security weighed upon and oppressed the primary school-teacher, and prevented him from getting thoroughly acquainted with the local population and school, and from enlarging and improving his knowledge. His humiliating legal status tended still further to accentuate the undesirable situation. It was pointed out in ministerial ordinances to the zemstvo school-teacher that he was not to consider himself as an official of the zemstvo. Without leave from the representative of the Ministry—the inspector of primary schools—he was not authorized to communicate directly with the zemstvo board nor to attend its meetings even by special invitation. Particular stress was laid in these ordinances on the fact that in holiday time the teachers still remained under the control of the inspector and were therefore not justified in leaving the school or taking part in any school commissions or teachers' conferences without special authorization. The directors of primary schools issued ordinances informing teachers that they would be liable to dismissal in the event of their subscribing to papers and reviews "considered to contain advanced views and criticisms on questions of education, religion and morality." The school-teacher who joined any teachers' union, were it merely one for mutual assistance, incurred the suspicion on the part of the government representative of being "politi-

cally undesirable"; and it became the duty of the inspectors of primary schools to see that membership in such a union "did not distract the teacher from fulfilling his proper duties." When in November 1913 the Yaroslav Mutual Aid Association attempted to organize a public meeting to hear and discuss papers read by two of its members on "New tendencies in grammar" and "The principle of self-expression in primary schools," the authorities forbade the meeting on the ground that "the proposed debates might disturb the public peace." Pedagogical publications contained many instances of the extremely discourteous behavior of the inspectors toward the teachers of primary schools. Particularly depressing to the teacher was the uncertainty of his being permitted to remain at the same school for any length of time. The teachers were being continually transferred from one school to another, frequently against their own wishes. A mere order of the school administration to that effect was sufficient.

A solution of the problem of the teaching staff depended primarily on the policy of the Ministry of Education. Besides the government schools which it directly administered and maintained, the zemstvo schools were also under its control; and the church schools under its supervision. The immediate management of all schools devolved on the curators of the educational districts, while the special superintendence of the primary schools was entrusted to directors of primary schools, one to each province (from 1874 onward), with a staff of subordinate district inspectors (from 1869).

Under the chairmanship of the local marshal of nobility, provincial and district school councils were established in 1874 as collegiate bodies dealing within the province and district with questions of primary education. The inspector of primary schools was the principal agent of the Government in matters relating to primary schools. The pressure he exercised was of the highest importance, because the main object of the educational policy of the Ministry was to isolate these schools as completely as it could from the influence of the local government. Even the decision to establish school boards was attributed to the necessity of "safeguarding primary schools from pernicious and corrupting influences." Only the charge of the economic and material welfare of the schools devolved upon the zemstvos; while the exclusive right of guiding, superintending, and inspecting the educational side of the schools belonged to the Ministry.

The mistrust of all public and private initiative, so characteristic of the educational policy of the Ministry of Education, made itself particularly prominent in the years immediately preceding the War, when M. Kasso was in office as Minister. In the field of primary education every measure was taken to withdraw completely all primary schools from the influence of the organs of local government, to secure absolute control, and to transform the school-teacher into a bureaucrat.

The inspector of primary schools was empowered to appoint teachers to zemstvo schools without notifying the zemstvo board (ordinance of February 2, 1914), to dismiss teachers, and to reverse by his personal authority the decisions of the school board (ordinance of October 11, 1914). The teachers were forbidden to consider themselves as zemstvo officials, and by this the zemstvos were deprived of the right of direct communication, even by correspondence, with the zemstvo school-teachers. All such communications, as well as the supply of information required by the zemstvo board from the teachers, were henceforth to be carried on exclusively through the medium of the inspectors of primary schools (ordinance of August 22, 1914). The zemstvo boards were expressly forbidden to "interfere" in the educational and instructional province of the schools. The school premises themselves, even though they were built with the aid of zemstvo funds, were declared to be government property (decision of the Senate,[5] 1913).

Simultaneously the Ministry of Education continued to hamper the organs of local government in the matter of adult and post-school education, that is, in a sphere entirely created by the efforts of zemstvo institutions. In 1913 the zemstvos of thirty-four provinces spent 2,588,000 rubles on this work, whereas the expenses of the Ministry of Education for a similar object amounted to less than 300,000 rubles for the whole of the Russian Empire. School libraries were placed under the superintendence of the inspector of primary schools, who in the majority of the educational districts, pronounced the existing libraries to be unsuitable for popular reading. The curators of the educational districts frequently authorized classes for adults only within the limits of the syllabus for two-class primary schools. The government authorities permitted lectures and readings

[5] The Supreme Court of Russia.

on the premises of primary schools, on condition that such readings were only from books and pamphlets approved by the inspectors.

Similar instances might be multiplied *ad infinitum*. They were but the outcome of the general policy of the Ministry of Education. From the time, however, when the Government decided on the introduction of universal education, these tendencies became somewhat less pronounced. The scheme of a bill for elementary schools drawn up by M. Schwartz, predecessor of M. Kasso, contained a provision extending the rights of the zemstvos with regard to the management of primary schools. M. Kasso withdrew this bill from the Duma, having decided "finally to define the legal relations between the zemstvos and schools maintained by zemstvo funds, and between zemstvos and teachers."

The majority of inspectors of the primary schools were persons unprepared for such complicated and responsible work as the direction of primary education, and were consequently incapable of exercising any moral authority over the school-teachers. The Duma frequently drew the attention of the Minister to this anomalous situation; but nothing was done until the law of July 7, 1913 provided that vacancies for inspectors of primary schools were henceforth to be filled only by men with university or equivalent training, or by persons who held the position of teacher in an upper primary school, on condition that they had had practical experience in the methods and procedure of primary education. It should be noted that, in virtue of the above law, all existing inspectors of primary schools were retained.

M. Kasso did not confine himself as Minister of Education to organizing supervision of the primary schools; he dealt also with their internal working. In 1913 a scheme for a new course of studies for primary schools was elaborated by the Ministry. The old schedule indeed stood in need of radical revision. Instead of developing a pupil's general interest in books and his love of them and enabling him to understand and digest what he read and consequently to appreciate intellectual work, the curricula of 1897 demanded primarily a knowledge of grammar and a thorough grasp of the intricate rules of Russian orthography, without taking into account the fact that it would be a great achievement in a pupil of a primary school even to express himself clearly and intelligibly in writing. The new ministerial curriculum, far from granting any concessions to the actual

needs of the school, thought it necessary to make the rules in regard to grammar and spelling still more stringent. It is not to be wondered at that the pedagogical periodicals were unanimous in their trenchant criticism of the new scheme.

M. Kasso treated with similar indifference the wishes so frequently expressed by the zemstvos and writers on education as regards summer courses for teachers. Such courses were generally organized during the school holidays by local government bodies for the purpose of giving school-teachers the opportunity of improving and refreshing their knowledge and of becoming acquainted with recent developments in education. The "rules for temporary courses for teachers" ratified by the Ministry as long ago as August 5, 1875 had since become obsolete. In practice they had undergone considerable alteration. M. Kasso reissued these rules, according to which the courses were placed under the exclusive jurisdiction of the inspectors of primary schools, and the part played by their organizers was almost entirely limited to the provision of the necessary funds. He thus effectively extinguished any desire on the part of the zemstvos to organize such courses, and of the teachers to attend them.

The greater part of the measures taken by M. Kasso, as well as almost all those of his predecessor, were dictated by the deeply-rooted conviction that the school policy should conform fully and unreservedly with the views and plans of the Minister of the Interior.

Nowhere, perhaps, was this dependence of the schools on the general trend of government policy so conspicuous as in the schools situated in regions with a predominating non-Russian population, such as Russian Poland, Lithuania, the Baltic provinces, and to a certain extent, Little Russia, as well as in the treatment of non-Russian pupils in Russian schools. This problem was particularly acute in the secondary schools; but in the field of elementary education it also gave rise to a number of questions of primary importance which were never satisfactorily settled because the solution was invariably sought for by the use of the methods and in the general spirit of the Russian bureaucratic system.

The years of the great reforms of Alexander II, which were marked by a benevolent attitude toward non-Russian school children, were almost immediately followed by a period when the very opposite tendencies in general and school policy prevailed. In the rules, sanctioned by the Emperor on April 26, 1870, concerning schools for

the non-Russian elements of the population, the Russification of such foreign elements was set forth as the first and most pressing purpose of the elementary schools. The immediate result of this order was the prohibition of the use in teaching in elementary schools of the mother tongue of the children. Russian pedagogues pointed out that such a prohibition meant the impossibility of a child unfamiliar with the Russian language attending schools, and that in the interest of the country and in order to help the spread of the Russian language elementary schools should use the native tongue of the pupils as a foundation for their general development and as an instrument for assisting them in grasping the various subjects taught, including the Russian language itself.

The great Russian teacher, Ushinsky, wrote as follows on this subject:

> A school which does not teach a child his native tongue is far below him. What mean hundreds of memorized words when compared with the deep, rich and vital tongue which the nation has created and for which it has suffered through the centuries. . . . Not only does the child enter such a school from an environment which is entirely foreign to the school, but he also returns from the school to a foreign environment. He will soon forget the few Russian words he was taught and at the same time he will forget the ideas which were associated with them. His native tongue and the popular ideas will again recover their empire over him and will delete all impression of the school as of something entirely foreign. What has such a school accomplished? Worse than nothing, for it has delayed the natural development of the child for some years.

Schools for non-Russian children, like many other aspects of Russian life, benefited temporarily by the social movement of 1905-1907. The Regulations of March 31, 1906 and November 1, 1907 provided that in the case of non-Russian children the mother tongue should be used for the first two years of the primary school. The wave of reaction which swept the country during the following years was not slow in neutralizing the effects of these measures. M. Kasso authorized the use of native tongues in elementary schools only in such cases where it appeared from experience that the pupils, before the completion of their second year of school work, were unable to carry on their work in the Russian speech. However, the deciding of such cases rested neither with the teachers nor with the parents, but with

a representative of the Ministry of Education, a procedure which naturally deprived the conditional privilege conceded by the Ministry of all practical significance. The same Minister prohibited the use of the Polish tongue in the elementary schools of the Kingdom of Poland, and it was during his tenure of office that Curator Shcherbakov issued similar orders for the Baltic provinces, though allowing the use of native languages for the teaching of religion.

The results of government school policy in the territories with a predominant non-Russian population fully justified the apprehensions of the educators. It would appear from the data of the census of 1897, that in Russian Poland and Lithuania illiteracy increased in direct proportion to the number of schools. This seems to show that in localities where the population ignored the elementary State schools and succeeded in organizing home education or in creating an elementary school of its own, the percentage of illiteracy was considerably lower than in those regions where the population was satisfied with the elementary schools of the general type. The same census proved that the level of education was considerably lower in the Ukrainian provinces than in those of central Russia. The percentage for the whole of Russia of men and women able to read and write was 23.3, while in certain northern and central provinces it rose to 36.1 per cent. The number of literate men and women in the Ukrainian provinces did not exceed 16.4 per cent (Chernigov), declining to 10.5 per cent (Podolsk), and even as low as 9.4 per cent (Volhynia). A similar development, but possibly in a still more acute form, may be observed in the Caucasus. M. Yanovsky, curator of the educational district of the Caucasus, one of the few curators who were gratefully remembered by the teachers and who was not only an administrator but was also an eminent educator, points out in his report for the year 1892 that as a result of "the unsatisfactory organization of elementary schools" within his jurisdiction, they not only were heavily handicapped in their struggle against illiteracy, but even perhaps "contribute to the widening of the gulf between the Russian and the non-Russian sections of the community."

The position of non-Russian children attending elementary schools for Russian children was just as abnormal; in this respect government policy toward the Jews was very typical. The general position of the Jews may be considered a good illustration of the prevailing trend of government policy. In particular, government meas-

ures relating to the education of Jewish children were always a most sensitive instrument for registering the political moods of the moment.

In practice the problem of Jewish school children became more acute only with reference to the elementary municipal schools in the south and southwest of Russia. This was primarily due to the law restricting the area open to Jewish residents to certain south and southwest provinces,[6] and also to the decision of the Council of Ministers sanctioned by the Emperor on May 3, 1882 which prohibited the Jews from residing, owning, or leasing real property in agricultural districts even within the area where they were allowed to live.

Under the law the admittance to elementary schools of Jewish children whose parents were legally domiciled in that district was entirely unrestricted, and in this respect differed from the law governing the admittance of Jews to secondary schools. The orders of the Minister of Education, however, were not slow in imposing obstructions to the admittance of Jewish children into elementary schools. The essence of these restrictions was that Jewish children were not eligible until all other children had been properly accommodated. Taking into consideration the habitual overcrowding of the elementary schools in towns and cities, we may see that a decision of this kind was often equivalent to the unqualified exclusion of Jewish children from such schools. It will be enough to glance through the Jewish papers[7] for the autumn months when registration in the schools was taking place, to find ample evidence of the extreme difficulty and at times the impossibility of Jewish children gaining admittance into elementary schools. Following the wholesale refusal in 1910 to admit Jewish children into elementary municipal schools of Zhitomir, the municipal board in vain petitioned the Minister of Education that Jews be given equal rights of admission with other children. In 1911 not a single Jew was admitted to the elementary city schools of Ekaterinoslav, all vacancies being filled with non-Jewish children. In 1912, as a result of a report by M. Kasso to the Emperor, the elementary schools of Zlinsk (Province of Chernigov) were entirely closed to Jews. And additional incidents might be added. The reports of the Minister of Education to the Emperor for the years 1905 to 1910

[6] Bessarabia, Vilna, Vitebsk, Volhynia, Grodno, Ekaterinoslav, Kiev, Kovno, Minsk, Mogilev, Podolsk, Poltava, Taurida, Kherson, and Chernigov.

[7] *Voskhod* (*Sunrise*), *Novi Voskhod* (*The New Sunrise*).

show that the percentage of Jewish children admitted to the various elementary municipal schools never exceeded 7.7 per cent of the total number of children registered, declining occasionally as low as 1.2 per cent, and that in towns where the Jewish population exceeded 50 per cent.

The rigid and narrow policy of centralization and Russification followed by the Russian Government not only closed the schools to a large section of the population which was kept in ignorance, but also endangered the very unity and strength of the nation. It certainly did little to develop among the millions of non-Russian subjects of the Russian Crown a feeling of affection and gratitude for a Government which denied it satisfaction of its most pressing cultural needs.

All the positive measures that may be placed to the credit of the Ministry during the years immediately preceding the War, such as the introduction of universal primary education, were prepared and carried through the initial and most difficult stages by M. Kasso's predecessors, and chiefly by the efforts of the State Duma and the local government bodies. The action of the Duma, which, while ruthlessly criticizing the educational policy of the Ministry of Education, nevertheless on its own initiative insisted on an increase of the education estimates, seems to be unique in parliamentary history. It was at the instance of the Duma that, in the course of the five years beginning with 1908, the estimates of the Ministry of Education were nearly doubled. During the three years preceding the War the credits for new primary schools reached 22 million rubles under the head of universal education, and 344 million rubles under that of building fund.

In summing up the policy of the Ministry of Education down to the year 1914, it may be said that with regard to primary education it was mainly confined to what was officially styled the "regulation of the schools." In spite of the Ministry's contentions, the creative element was absent, and the cleavage between its tendencies and the desires of the public was not only not bridged over, but was rather demonstratively emphasized by the former. The obvious unwillingness of the Ministry to consider public opinion was, perhaps, the most striking feature of the problem of elementary education.

At their ordinary autumn sessions in 1914, the zemstvos were unanimous in denouncing this policy of the Ministry. They pointed out that "at almost every step and in every branch of their activity

the zemstvos have been confronted with obstacles raised by the government educational authorities." At the discussion of the budget for 1913 the Duma recorded

> that the Ministry of Education, viewing in many cases with indifference the needs of national education, not only does not manifest any desire to carry out the necessary reforms, but even places obstacles in the way of their achievement, when the Duma takes measures for the purpose; that, besides showing an absence of a regular plan in its current work and of forethought for the increasingly urgent requirements of the future, the Ministry has given no proof of constructive work during recent years, while it has failed to coöperate sufficiently with the public forces of the country; that its attitude towards the teachers is abnormal and towards the pupils formal and discouraging.

In spite of the many defects in Russian primary education, its progress up to 1914, especially when compared with earlier times, was undeniable. In the various aspects of this progress the growth in the number of schools stands first. In the more recent period, in addition to the increase in numbers, considerable improvements in quality also became apparent. The general impetus toward education, manifested during the ten to fifteen years before the War, was felt likewise in the primary schools. The zemstvo school in particular showed marked progress in the methods of instruction and in respect of the supply of up-to-date and improved textbooks; the principle of self-expression of children was introduced, greater care was bestowed on the moral as well as on the physical development of the children, and so forth. The schools, especially those of the zemstvo, enlisted the sympathies of the people to an increasing extent. The rapidity with which the village school introduced various improvements such as libraries, demonstration of educational films, popular lectures, theaters, etc., was proof that it had become an active center of attraction in the village, not merely to the children but also to adults.

As to the defects of the elementary schools, these under normal conditions would have been easily overcome in practice by a change in the policy of the Government.

2. *Secondary Schools in 1914.*

Under the laws in force in 1914, the co-education of boys and girls, as practiced in the elementary schools, was not admitted in the secondary schools under the control of the Ministry of Education. Certain very rare exceptions to this rule were made in particular cases and by special Imperial sanction in each case. The secondary schools were placed under the control of the Ministry of Education.

The secondary schools for boys comprised the classical *gymnasia* (high schools), the *pro-gymnasia*, or lower gymnasia, usually with only the four junior classes, and the *real* schools (high schools).

In conformity with the Imperial decree of July 20, 1902, which for some unknown reason was never made public, the gymnasia were divided into two main types. Both the classical languages, Latin and Greek, were taught in those of the first type, and Latin only in those of the second. Subsequently, by Imperial decree of April 30, 1905, also unpublished, the gymnasia teaching two classical languages were again divided into two groups: those in which classics became the chief subject, and those in which they held a secondary place, while other new subjects such as logic, psychology, jurisprudence, and natural history were also introduced. In 1914 Latin was the only classical language taught in the majority of the gymnasia. The curriculum of these gymnasia included courses in religion, Russian, literature, Latin, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, physics, history, geography, French, German (only one modern language was compulsory), natural history, logic, psychology, elementary law, penmanship, drawing, and physical training. The course of instruction in all gymnasia lasted eight years.

The *real* schools were likewise divided into distinct types. In some, the two senior classes comprised two divisions: the fundamental and the commercial; in others, the fundamental only. A special supplementary class might be opened in connection with the fundamental division for preparing pupils for entering higher special colleges. In 1914 the majority of *real* schools had only one fundamental division; and nearly all had the special supplementary class. The course of study in the *real* school lasted six years. The supplementary class added one more year. The curriculum of the real schools differed from that of the gymnasia by the absence of classics, a reduced number of hours given to religion and Russian, a wider course of mathe-

matics, geography, natural science, and drawing, the compulsory study of two modern languages and, finally, by including a course of mechanical drawing. Parallel to the secondary boys' schools under government control, there existed so-called private gymnasia and *real* schools, that is, schools opened with the permission of the Ministry of Education by private initiative, by local government organs, and by various societies and organizations. According to the regulations in force in 1914, private secondary schools might, in the first place, be invested with full legal rights and privileges, secondly, with rights for the pupils only; lastly came those with no rights whatever.

In the schools with full rights, the legal status both of the pupils and of the educational staff were similar to those of pupils and staffs in the government schools. At the same time all appointments of the teaching and official staff had to be ratified by the Government. The founders, who provided the funds for the endowment and maintenance of such schools, retained hardly any influence over the internal life of the school, nor could they introduce any improvements or innovations outside the narrow limits of the general statute of the State gymnasia and *real* schools. Private persons were also prohibited from opening schools with senior classes only, although the demand for private schools of this type was very great, since the pupils of the pro-gymnasia, who were prevented from completing their education in the gymnasia through lack of room, could have done so had such schools been opened. The second group of private secondary schools were distinguished from those with full rights in that their teaching and administrative staff did not possess the rights and privileges enjoyed by the officials of the government schools, while the pupils received the right to enter the universities and colleges only on condition of passing final examinations held in the presence and under the direction of a delegate from the educational district. The law of July 1, 1914, passed on the initiative of the Duma, somewhat widened the sphere of rights of the founders of semi-privileged private secondary schools, by granting them, when authorized by the curator of the educational district, the right to open co-educational schools and to introduce certain alterations in the established government curriculum. Nevertheless, the only textbooks and equipment allowed in these schools were those authorized by the Ministry of Education, while the teachers were obliged to possess qualifications equivalent to those required of teachers in State schools.

Lastly the private schools with no rights, which likewise could not be opened without the permission of the Ministry, were free in their choice of the scope and course of studies, with the exception of certain limitations as to the language in which instruction was to be given and of the compulsory teaching of such subjects as religion, Russian, Russian history and geography. The pupils of schools without rights could obtain secondary-school certificates only on passing appropriate examinations as external students at government schools or at the district board of education.

At a later date, the new Minister of Education, Count Ignatiev, recognized officially that private schools "which had been opened throughout the Empire, even in small and remote settlements, wherever a certain number of pupils, however small, could be expected, sometimes served large areas and successfully filled the place of government schools, while entailing no expenditure on the Treasury."

The general secondary schools for boys were not a natural continuation of the primary schools. As was pointed out above, it was with considerable reservations that the upper primary schools could be looked upon as the first stage toward secondary education.

Neither was the principle of a uniform education fully adhered to in the relations between the secondary and the higher schools. According to the laws in force in 1914, the first claim to a university education lay with those pupils who had completed the course at government or fully privileged private gymnasia, or at private gymnasia possessing rights for pupils, on condition the latter had passed the required examinations in the presence of an officer of the Ministry of Education, and had thus obtained the proper certificate (*attestat zrelosti*). This certificate gave the right of entrance to all the universities and that of taking the entrance examinations for all technical colleges.

Pupils who had attended the supplementary class of the *real* schools acquired the right of taking entrance examinations for technical colleges, but were barred from the universities. The only exception was the University of Warsaw, which the pupils of *real* schools might enter on condition of passing an examination in Latin and Greek at some government gymnasium.

The difference in the standing of the pupils who graduated from gymnasia and those who graduated from *real* schools and to a certain extent the difference in their course of studies may be largely ex-

plained by the desire of the Ministry of Education to introduce the caste principle in the organization of schools. This idea which seemed to be defunct as a result of the reforms of Alexander II, was again revived in the middle 'eighties. Henceforth the Ministry of Education was greatly concerned with "measures for the adequate selection of students of secondary schools and colleges."

In 1885, M. Delyanov, Minister of Education, stated in an address to the State Council that in opening new schools the Ministry intended to follow a scheme which was adapted to the requirements of the class organization of society and that the education offered by the gymnasia was harmful for the lower stratum. At the same time, a colleague and supporter of M. Delyanov, M. Georgievsky, developed in a memorandum the idea of the "fallacy of a school for all" and of the danger of the "democratization of schools." "In order to prevent a too large representation among students in gymnasia and pro-gymnasia of children from the lower classes, the increase of which is considered highly undesirable because it unnecessarily augments the number of young men seeking university education," ordinances issued by the Ministry of Education in 1887 ruled that children of persons carrying on "objectionable occupations" were ineligible for such schools, and ordered the closure of preparatory schools which were attached to the gymnasia. On June 18 of the same year was published the ordinance famous in the history of Russian secondary schools, which was widely known among Russian educators as the "ordinance on the cook's children." "The Minister being deeply concerned with the raising of the standard of students in gymnasia and pro-gymnasia," the ordinance reads,

> deems it necessary to limit to admittance to these schools only such children as are in the charge of persons presenting sufficient guarantees that the children are properly taken care of. . . . The gymnasia and pro-gymnasia, therefore, shall be freed from the attendance of children of drivers, footmen, cooks, laundry-women, small traders, and other persons similarly situated, whose children, with the exception perhaps of the exceptionally gifted ones, should not be encouraged to abandon the social environment to which they belong.

From that date, and in spite of the unequivocal statement of the law which opened the doors of the secondary schools to "children of all conditions . . . without distinction of birth or religion," the Min-

istry of Education continued until the outbreak of the Great War to enforce its policy of distributing children among the secondary schools of various types in accordance with the social group to which they belonged. This is the point of view espoused by M. Kasso when he declared himself against the bill on secondary schools prepared by the Duma, embodying the principle that secondary schools should be open to all. For the same reason M. Lavretsky, curator of the West-Siberian district, revived in 1913 the ordinance of Delyanov, which had fallen into disuse, closing preparatory schools attached to the gymnasia. In explanation of his decision he declared that "the accessibility of such schools to the poorer classes leads to the overcrowding of the gymnasia and prevents well-to-do parents from sending their children to school." At about the same time, Governor Kurlov on a tour of inspection of his province, referring to certain elementary and *real* schools he had visited, cynically remarked that they were far too luxurious for the children of the social groups from which their students were drawn.

The division of secondary schools into gymnasia and *real* schools, the difference in their course of studies and especially in the rights obtained on graduation, were, under the conditions described above, only one of the manifestations of the general policy of the Government to build the school system on a caste foundation.

The Ministry of Education had never, since the 'eighties, given up the idea of converting gymnasia into establishments for training the children of the gentry and of government officials. The doors of the universities were open primarily to those who passed through the gymnasia, and that is the reason why the course of studies of the gymnasia contained a relatively large proportion of the humanities, and especially of ancient languages which, in accordance with the official view, formed "the foundation for all further education." *Real* schools, on the other hand, were intended for the children of commoners and further college training was deemed superfluous for them, as it did not fit in with the environment to which they belonged; for that reason their program of studies was of a far more utilitarian nature.

The efforts of the Ministry of Education to create a school based on class distinction were not altogether futile. The actual distribution of students among various social groups may be seen from the following table:

Years	*Gymnasia and Pro-Gymnasia*			*Real Schools*		
	Gentry and government officials	*Commoners*	*Peasants*	*Gentry and government officials*	*Commoners*	*Peasants*
	(*percentages*)					
1881	47.5	37.2	8.0	41.2	40.4	11.8
1894	56.4	31.7	6.0	37.4	43.8	11.5
1902	47.5	36.2	9.4	34.3	43.3	15.7

The data quoted above show that before the publication by the Ministry of Education of the ordinances imbued with the caste principle, gymnasia and *real* schools were much nearer one another from the point of view of the social structure of their undergraduate body than they were after they had been put into effect. In the first half of the 'nineties, the *real* schools were much more democratic than the gymnasia, but at the opening of the twentieth century the democratization of the gymnasia began to take place, in spite of the efforts of the Ministry. In this process one should notice the advance in the standing of the peasants. As time went on this democratization of education and its expansion to new social groups, which in the past had been kept outside the school or which were necessarily satisfied with the elementary schools, was destined to proceed at a constantly increasing pace. The process of the democratization of secondary schools may be made particularly clear if we deal, not with the average data for the whole of Russia, since in some of the educational districts there was only a low percentage of gentry, but with the districts where the three fundamental social groups were sufficiently well represented; for instance, the percentage of pupils belonging to the gentry, the commoners, and the peasants in the secondary schools of the educational district of Vilna would not in that district justify a description of gymnasia as "schools for the children of the gentry."

Years	*Gymnasia and Pro-Gymnasia*			*Real Schools*		
	Gentry and government officials	*Commoners*	*Peasants*	*Gentry and government officials*	*Commoners*	*Peasants*
	(*percentages*)					
1888	62.9	26.9	6.2	53.3	31.8	11.4
1894	66.8	23.7	5.9	52.4	33.1	11.4
1902	58.8	26.2	10.8	50.0	33.1	14.3
1910	37.3	39.0	18.4	25.6	42.8	28.1

It appears, therefore, that by 1914 the hope of the Ministry of Education of reorganizing the secondary schools on a strictly caste

basis had proved a complete failure. Social barriers, so far as the secondary schools were concerned, were rapidly being broken down and the representatives of the lower strata of the urban population and of the peasantry were gradually gaining admission to the secondary schools of various types, and through them to the universities, in spite of the obstacles placed in their way by the Ministry of Education.

Under these conditions the maintenance of a distinction in the legal rights to be attained on graduation from gymnasia and from *real* schools seems to have lost all justification, even from the point of view of the educational policy of the Government itself. The Ministry, nevertheless, continued to hold to its position. This, in practice, led to an absurd situation. In a certain town all pupils of the secondary school were denied entrance to the universities, not, as would have been in accordance with the intention of the Ministry, because of their social standing, but because for some reason or another this town had no gymnasium, its only school being a *real* school!

In proportion to the population, the total number of secondary schools for boys was more than inadequate. Thanks to the energy displayed by the Duma and the persistence of the Financial Committee of the State Council during the period 1911 to 1915, the number of secondary schools increased considerably. From the year 1908 onward both Houses never ceased to insist on the urgency of developing the system of secondary schools and of coördinating the creation of new schools on some definite plan, which hitherto had been completely lacking. In deference to the above representations the Ministry of Education intimated to the local educational authorities that, after consulting the executive officers of the province or district concerned, the marshals of nobility, and the representatives of local government, they should during the next four or five years indicate localities where the need for new secondary schools was most acutely felt, with a view to the foundation of such schools. The information required by the Ministry could not be used until 1911. The project was completed by July 1, 1915, except in certain areas with regard to which the data were insufficient. The increase in the number of secondary schools founded by private persons or societies proceeded concurrently with the increase in the government schools. The total progress is shown by the following figures:

Year	Total number of secondary schools for boys	Schools founded by		
		Ministry of Education	Societies	Private persons
1911	577	435	66	76
1915	797	575	126	96

Out of the total of 797 educational establishments opened by July 1, 1915, there were 441 gymnasia and 29 pro-gymnasia accommodating 152,110 pupils, and 284 *real* schools accommodating 80,800 pupils.

According to the explanatory statement of the Ministry of Education for the year 1914, the ratio of government secondary schools with full rights to male inhabitants in European Russia, exclusive of Finland, the Caucasus, and the provinces in which the two capitals were situated, reached its maximum in the province of Vladimir, namely, one school to 57,400, and its minimum in the province of Plotsk, where it was one school to 376,400. It follows, that at best there existed one secondary school to over 4,000 boys of the corresponding school age.

Besides the secondary schools for boys mentioned above, from 1896 onward local public bodies and institutions promoted and financed special secondary schools under the jurisdiction of state departments other than the Ministry of Education. Other Ministries instituted their own educational departments, which were developed gradually. This fact gave rise to the remark made by the author of the report of the School Committee of the Duma, that "by its inactivity the Ministry of Education had very nearly abolished itself," and that in the domain of secondary education it "all but remained the Ministry of classical gymnasia alone."

Of all the special secondary schools, the commercial schools under the control of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry made the most marked progress. By 1913 there existed in Russia 203 commercial schools, of which 65 were for pupils of either sex; 14 new ones were added in 1913. Since the founders of that type of school were less hampered in their rights and had more freedom to influence the internal life and methods of education and instruction of the school, many private individuals and societies, desirous of opening a school of the type of a gymnasium or *real* school, disguised it under the form of a secondary commercial school with a program of studies closely approaching that of the standard secondary schools. Many commer-

cial schools, under the control of a Ministry reputed to be more advanced than the Ministry of Education, succeeded in attaining a much higher educational standard.

Among special secondary schools should also be included the theological seminaries under the Holy Synod and the military academies (*kadetski korpus*) of the Ministry of War. Both these types contained so many peculiarities as regards their administration, educational system, and course of studies, that they must be considered outside the scope of the present treatise.

The secondary educational establishments for girls were placed either under the control of the Ministry of Education—gymnasia and pro-gymnasia, or under the Department of the Institutions of the Empress Marie—gymnasia, pro-gymnasia, and girls' colleges (*institut*), or, lastly, under the Ecclesiastical Department—diocesan schools.

The course of instruction in the gymnasia for girls lasted seven years, with an additional eighth year in a special training class for teachers. The course of studies differed from that of the boys' gymnasia chiefly by the absence of classics and by including a somewhat reduced course of mathematics, a different distribution of subjects, lessons in needlework, compulsory study of two modern languages, and, particularly, by providing an eighth year for the theory and practice of teaching. Similarly, the girls' colleges (*institut*) had seven classes with one additional class; the majority of these colleges were intended for girls of gentle birth. Their number did not exceed some thirty in all. The diocesan schools had a six years' course, and belonged to the type of boarding or semi-boarding schools, being intended mainly for the daughters of the clergy. It follows therefore that the progress of secondary education among women depended principally on the gymnasia and pro-gymnasia.

The gymnasia for girls, moreover, differed from those for boys, in that the pupils of the upper primary girls' schools had the right of entrance to the corresponding class of the gymnasia on passing an examination in modern languages. On the other hand, owing to the scarcity of women's universities, the number of women to whom a university education could be given was very limited.

By 1914 there existed 873 gymnasia and 92 pro-gymnasia for girls, accommodating 383,577 pupils. The majority of these were founded on the initiative of private individuals or civic bodies. The

private schools for girls, like those for boys, possessed either full rights, rights for pupils only, or no rights at all. The Ministry of Education displayed complete indifference to the spread of secondary education for women and was very sparing in its grants for new schools.

The budget estimates for 1913 of the Ministry of Education provided 26,077,568 rubles for secondary schools for boys and girls. This was more than twice the figure for 1911 (12,957,662 rubles). The increase, however, was mainly due to the development of the boys' secondary-school system. Of all the secondary schools for girls in 1913 only 37 gymnasia were provided entirely by the Ministry, at an outlay of 597,868 rubles, besides which the Ministry granted 1,252,623 rubles in subsidies to gymnasia for girls maintained by civic organizations, which amounted to approximately 5 per cent of the actual cost of their upkeep. In 1914 it proposed to grant 27,519,869 rubles for the maintenance of secondary schools, of which 610,691 rubles was intended for girls' schools under its exclusive control, and 1,355,323 rubles for subsidies to all other educational establishments for girls.

The Ministry of Education recognized the urgency of a radical reform in secondary education. Already on May 13, 1906, in its address to the First Duma, the Government stated that "recognizing the urgent necessity of raising the moral and intellectual standard of the masses of the population, the Government is putting forward proposals for universal education and is preparing a scheme for the reform of the secondary schools and universities." Nevertheless, not only were the bills promised by the Government not ready by 1914, but their elaboration had not even been begun by the Ministry.

Of the laws concerning secondary schools promulgated in the period immediately preceding the War, the most important were the law of May 10, 1912, "on the improvement of the material position of officers of secondary schools for boys," the law of July 1, 1914, "on private educational establishments possessing the legal status of government schools," and the law of July 1, 1914, "on training colleges for men and women teachers in secondary schools." All these laws, the three last of which were entirely due to the initiative of the Duma, were but partial amendments to the fundamental laws of 1871 and 1872, which continued to serve as the basis of secondary education.

On the initiative of 83 of its members, the Duma proceeded to

work out a new statute for the secondary schools. The Minister of Education, M. Kasso, declared himself opposed "on educational grounds" to the Duma bill, and in particular to the principle embodied in it, of the unity of the educational system by which secondary schools were to be thrown open to the broad masses of the population. The bill as conceived by the Duma was destined never to be enacted.

While the Ministry showed a total lack of creative work in the domain of secondary education, it displayed a strong tendency to centralize the administration of secondary schools, thus depriving not only public but also educational bodies of any voice in their management.

The author of the report of the School Committee of the Duma, M. Kovalevsky, frequently pointed out the necessity of "opposing the unproductive, paralyzing, and absolutely inexpedient centralization" which prevailed in the Ministry of Education. As a consequence of it "the officials deplored the interminable red tape, while parents complained of endless worries and traveling expenses; the educational staff were offended by the want of confidence displayed toward them even in small matters, and the pupils suffered most of all."

The system of educational districts, owing to its organization and to the limited number of the districts (15 in all for the whole of Russia) offered no remedy against the firmly established departmental centralization, nor could it restrict the control exercised by the government offices over the life of the secondary schools. The curator of the educational district was the chief administrator of the secondary schools, while the district inspectors, among whom the various schools were apportioned, were charged with the immediate supervision. The district inspector, who resided in the principal center, where the administrative board had its headquarters, was perhaps able to visit each of the schools under his supervision once or at the most twice a year; in the more distant towns such a visit was a rare event, happening once in many years. Naturally the district inspector, having spent at best five or six hours in the school during the course of the year, was utterly incapable of forming an estimate of the progress of the school, of the causes of the pupils' ignorance, or of the state of the moral education. At a later date, the new Minister of Education, Count Ignatiev, in referring to such inspectors' visits, quite rightly remarked that far from being a means of looking

thoroughly into all sides of secondary-school life, they had become merely casual and superficial "inspections."

In the case of the private schools, which were particularly out of favor with the educational authorities, the inspectors' visits became not so much inspections as veritable punitive expeditions, to which pupils and teachers alike looked forward with fear and trembling. During M. Kasso's tenure of office, lessons were suspended for three days at one of the best private schools in Petrograd, because the hall porter was not wearing the proper uniform.

With regard to those secondary schools which the district authorities happened to visit about once in every five or six years, the control over their life and work was limited to the perusal of the numerous school reports. The number of reports demanded by the authorities was truly a scourge to the school, as their compilation took up much of the staff's valuable time; they were likewise a burden to the district inspectors, who were obliged to devote many hours to a correspondence which was incessant and essentially futile.

The control by the district authorities of the vital forces of education, which are of a highly individual character, and to whose progress or regression figures alone afford no clue, was accordingly limited either to a superficial inspection, or to a purely documentary supervision.

The numerous ordinances issued by the Ministry of Education and by the educational district authorities were but another variety of the same documentary supervision. These ordinances sought to make provision for every minor contingency in the life of secondary schools and left no margin for the individual endeavors of an independent educational staff.

The ordinances laid down the lists of textbooks, etc., to be used in the schools, the methods of rating the progress of the pupils, the qualifications and the grades required by pupils for admission to examinations, the number of times a pupil might enter for the same examination, the methods of supervision to be adopted in and out of school, the terms on which Jewish children might be admitted to the secondary schools, the conditions for election to the parents' committees, the alterations to be introduced in the school's courses of studies, and so forth.

No doubt certain of these ordinances, even during M. Kasso's term of office, possessed a considerable and even a lasting value. Thus, the

new schemes for teaching history and geography, worked out by the Ministry, contained much that was of educational interest, and as compared with the former syllabus certainly marked a considerable advance. These positive measures, however, of an isolated character, were in themselves insufficient to improve the general state of secondary education, which stood in need of a sweeping, well-planned reform, carried out on sound, logical, and practical lines. On the contrary, in the words of the resolution adopted by the Duma in the general debate on the budget of 1914, the ministerial and district ordinance, instead of paving the way for reform, "evinced a marked unwillingness on the part of the Minister to consider the feelings of the community and especially of parents in respect of their inalienable right to follow closely the activities of his Department. They also undermined the confidence in the school of the persons most intimately connected with it."

The ordinances issued by M. Kasso concerning "parents' committees" afford a striking illustration of the complete breach between the school, as set up by the Ministry, and the requirements of the community. At a time when the close coöperation of family and school in the work of educating and training the rising generation had long since become an accepted principle, the Minister of Education published an ordinance to the effect that elections to the parents' committee of a given school were to be considered valid only if two-thirds of the parents were present at the meeting. In addition to this, M. Kasso by an ordinance of January 26, 1913 completely abolished parents' committees in private secondary schools not possessing full rights.[8]

At the same time he did not consider it necessary to take steps to put an end to the anomalous position of the parents' committees of the numerous secondary schools in Moscow. In December 1905, in

[8] The parents' committees in the secondary schools were organized on the initiative of the parents themselves in the autumn of 1905 when the wave of revolutionary disturbance had reached its crest and was swamping the schools. The parents' committees were sanctioned by an ordinance of the Minister of Education dated November 25, 1905, and their chairmen were authorized to take part in the deliberations of the school councils. The jurisdiction and functions of the committees, however, remained rather vague until the publication of the ordinance of August 5, 1906, when they were confined within very narrow limits: "The resolutions of these committees are the expression of their own opinions and wishes, and they may be discussed by the school

connection with the riots which then took place in that city, all the secondary-school parents' committees were closed by order of the Governor-General, Dubassov. This order remained in force for ten years, and was repealed only by Count Ignatiev. In spite of this, the Assistant-Minister, Baron Taube, representing the department explained the reason for the insignificant number of parents' committees (62) in existence in 1913 as a testimony of the confidence of the public in the policy of the Ministry. Far nearer the truth, however, were the words spoken by a member of the Duma, M. Krupensky, who did not by any means belong to the opposition. He declared in the course of a debate in the House: "There is not a single parent in all Russia with children in State schools, who is satisfied with those schools."

The internal state of the government secondary schools, as brought about by the Ministry of Education, fully justified the bitter words of the member of the Duma. Censure of the schools was pronounced on every side, from the most varied classes of the community. This criticism applied not so much to the system of education and the organization of the secondary schools as to the spirit in which these were framed. Nevertheless both of these stood in need of the most drastic reform.

The ministerial and district ordinances piled ever fresh layers of rules on the original statutes of 1871 and 1872 governing secondary schools. The powers and sphere of competence of the school boards, never very wide, were further limited by these ordinances. The school board was precluded from exercising any influence over the methods of instruction in the school.

The teacher's personality was completely effaced. By the regulations of the Ministry he was ordered to use certain textbooks, from which he was forbidden to deviate, and compelled to use each in a prescribed manner. For instance, in teaching history, it behoved the

boards if submitted to them." Teachers and public opinion alike attached great value to the work of these bodies as a method of coöperation between the school authorities and the family. In all cases when the school administration displayed a genuine desire to work with the committees and extended to them a hearty welcome, the benefits derived from this coöperation were considerable. After a certain hesitation the quorum required for the election of parents' committees was fixed at one-fifth of the number of all the parents and guardians residing within the city or town. This rule remained in force until 1912.

instructor "to emphasize the importance of and the part played by individual prominent historical characters, and not to lapse into historical hypotheses and scientifically unsound generalizations." The character of the whole body of class masters (*klassni nastovnik*) was completely perverted by these ordinances. The original idea was to create class masters who should watch over the individual progress of each pupil in their classes and be their principal advisers and leaders during their school life; but the ministerial ordinances transformed them into the chief producers of the endless accounts and reports required by the district authorities.

Finally, the curriculum of the secondary school was exceedingly overloaded, and particular subjects were distributed among the classes most unequally and not always successfully. The prevailing tendency was to overwhelm the pupil with the greatest possible amount of information, by taxing mainly his powers of memory. He merely committed the mass of information to memory without assimilating it. Marks being the only criterion of progress and the only means of encouragement or reproof, such a system of education had but a superficial effect on the child, and led him to study merely for the sake of obtaining marks and to prepare to answer only such questions as he expected would be asked.

The training of the will and mind of the pupils in the principles of sound and sensible moral discipline was completely ignored by the educators, who insisted on a purely formal compliance with external regulations. Self-help and all inclination to self-organization among the pupils were resolutely suppressed. The out-of-school supervision, one of the most unpopular measures of the Ministry, tended to cast suspicion on the authority of the parents themselves.

Under such circumstances, measures that in themselves were of a positive nature turned out prejudicial to education as a whole, instead of advancing it. The sensible firmness in the treatment of pupils was changed into a spiteful captiousness about trifles. Efforts to enforce discipline were replaced by formal supervision, and examinations became an instrument of repression. The most deplorable feature in the formal atmosphere that pervaded State secondary schools was the relation between teachers and pupils. They seemed divided into two hostile camps, to the extinction of all possibility of the school's exercising any moral influence on the pupils.

The general picture of the secondary schools would be incomplete

if the reader were not given at least some idea of the position occupied by the non-Russian students, and especially by the Jews. This problem, which throws a great deal of light on the general principles which guided the school policy of the Ministry, deserves a more detailed examination.

It was not until the middle of the last century that the desire of the Jews to send their children to secondary schools was manifested. Up to that time the Jews generally preferred to send their children to Jewish confessional schools (*chaider*) or to the special schools for Jews established in accordance with the decision of a Committee on Jews (1840). These latter schools, in the opinion of the Committee, were concerned rather with "the moral training of the Jews than with the transmission of positive knowledge"; they allowed the rabbis to teach religion in accordance with a short catechism approved by the Ministry "in order to counteract the pernicious influence of the Talmud, without however abolishing that book for the time being."

The 'sixties were an epoch in the history of Russian Jews, at which time the Government began to look upon them as citizens. The decision of the State Council, sanctioned by the Emperor on January 22, 1862, that Jewish children under the age of fourteen should not be baptized without the consent of their parents bears in itself evidence that the position of the Jews was still medieval.

During the years of the reforms not only was public opinion decidedly in favor of an unreserved repeal of all limitations to which the Jews were subjected and of their unrestricted admittance to all schools, but even government circles, in the person of a member of the Government, Count Valuev, urged the necessity "of a gradual repeal of all restrictions which prevent the intimate collaboration between the Jews and the rest of the population."

With the beginning of the emancipation of the Jews their attitude toward the Russian schools underwent a fundamental change. Russian schools and the Russian language appeared to them in a very different light, and the same parents who a short time before had refused even to entertain the idea of sending their children to a Russian school were now most anxious to get them in. The traditional Jewish confessional school, the *chaider*, lost a great amount of its popularity, and the schools for Jews established in the 'forties without the support of Jewish public opinion were in part closed and in part reorganized on a new basis.

After the middle of the century as a result of a new public spirit and of enactments reflecting it, the number of Jewish children in secondary schools rapidly increased. In 1853 the number of Jewish boys in gymnasia and pro-gymnasia was only 159, or 1.25 of the total, in 1873 it had increased to 6,521 or 13.2 per cent. In the course of the 'seventies their number was further increased. From 1870 to 1881 the number of Jewish boys attending gymnasia increased two and a half times.

But, to use the words of M. Georgievsky, a prominent official of the Ministry of Education in the 'eighties, "At the very time when education began to make its way in Jewish circles, the idea was forcibly presented that in this respect the present policy should be abandoned and that any action taken should be in the very opposite direction, that Jews should not be encouraged to enter the schools, but on the contrary should be prevented from doing so." Already in the early 'eighties the Ministry of Education, on the initiative of the Ministry of the Interior, enacted a number of measures designed to limit the unrestricted admission of the Jews into secondary schools. The reason officially given to explain these restrictions was the apprehension that "Jewish children would crowd out the Christian children" and that they might exercise a bad influence on the latter. The first restrictive measures were consolidated after June 1887, when the Minister of Education placed before the Council of Ministers a bill demanding the introduction of a quota for Jewish children in secondary schools and that admission to the schools be limited to children of the upper social strata. The Council decided that the purpose of the Minister might best be achieved by his own orders "for separate territories or educational institutions."

Basing his action on this decision of the Council of Ministers, M. Delyanov issued his famous ordinances of July 1 and 10, 1887. The first of these ordinances placed restrictions on the admission of Jews to the universities; the second, on their admission to the secondary schools.

The ordinances of July 1887 opened up a new epoch in the history of Jewish education. Issued in flagrant violation of the definite provision of the law that "Jewish children shall be admitted to all schools owned by the State on exactly the same ground as all other children," these ordinances, according to the assurance of their author, had a purely temporary character. As a matter of fact,

however, the Jewish quota, in spite of the many changes it underwent, not only remained continuously in force, but became the nucleus for numerous additional restrictions. Almost every year saw new difficulties placed in the path of Jewish children who wished to enter secondary schools, and the obstructing of the Jews in their desire to obtain a secondary education became more and more an important function of the Ministry of Education.

The ordinance of July 10, 1887, "in order to establish a more normal proportion of Jewish pupils to pupils of Christian families," prescribed "the limiting of the number of Jewish students to 10 per cent in the territories where the Jews enjoyed freedom of residence, to 5 per cent outside those territories, and in St. Petersburg and Moscow to 3 per cent, of the total number of students in each secondary school, gymnasium, pro-gymnasium or *real* school, as the case may be." For the time being, until the graduation of such Jewish students as were already entered in the schools, the aforesaid percentage was to be calculated on the basis of students admitted each year, and not with reference to the total number of students.

The quota for Jewish students having been introduced, the Ministry of Education lost no time in rigorously enforcing it. The ordinance of July 10, 1887 provided that the quota should be applied not only to those Jewish pupils entering school, but also to those who were for any reason transferred from one school to another, for instance, because of a change of residence by their parents. Exception was made only in favor of those students who, after graduation from a pro-gymnasium or after the completion of six years at a *real* school, sought admission to the senior classes of a gymnasium or to another *real* school for the continuation of their course of study. The Ministry decided that such students should be considered as merely passing from a junior to a senior class and not as transferring from one school to another. No other concessions in the general application of the quota were made, though "exceptional cases" might be considered. Therefore, when in 1892 a few thousand Jewish families, which for years had resided in Moscow, were deported by order of the Minister of the Interior, the parents were about a year in obtaining permission to transfer their children to the schools situated in the area where the Jews were allowed to reside. It would seem as though even such cases were not treated by the Ministry as "exceptional."

Shortly after the publication of the ordinance of 1887 the new statute with regard to *real* schools was enacted through the usual legislative procedure. Article 9 definitely stated that "*real* schools are open to children of all conditions without distinction of faith." It would seem that after the passing of this act the Jewish quota could not be applied to such schools. However, the Ministry of Education held a different view. It was pointed out that the new act did not repeal the Jewish quota, because Article 9 of the Statute of 1888 "does not contain a new provision, but merely reproduces Article 23 of the Statute of 1872." In spite of the flagrant fallacy of such an interpretation by the Ministry of Education, the judgment of this branch of the executive prevailed over the intent of the law, and the Jewish quota continued to be rigidly enforced in the face of a law which denied the right of such an enforcement.

In 1914, the restrictive regulation relating to Jewish children had for its basis the decision of the Council of Ministers of August 29, 1909. The principles embodied in this decision were largely a concession made by the Stolypin Government to the pressure of public opinion. The Jewish quota was increased to 5 per cent in St. Petersburg and Moscow, to 10 per cent in the provinces where the Jews did not enjoy freedom of residence, and to 15 per cent in the area where freedom of settlement was allowed them. However, this decision of the Council of Ministers undoubtedly made the situation of the Jews worse, by extending the quota to private schools enjoying full rights. As a result of the rapid growth of the private schools in latter years and of the undoubted fact that a large percentage of pupils of a great many such schools were Jews, the new regulations not only put the private schools into a very difficult position, but often endangered their very existence. However, the Ministry of Education refused to consider any objections. After a few concessions due to the swing of public opinion in 1904 to 1907, its policy toward the Jews resumed all its old-time intolerance.

Less than a year had elapsed after the publication of the Decision of the Council of Ministers of August 22, 1909, when by an ordinance of June 12, 1910 of the Minister of Education the application of the Jewish quota was extended to private secondary schools not enjoying full rights, that is, to the so-called private schools with rights for the students. The restrictions, however, did not stop here, and they were soon directed against private secondary schools for

Jewish children alone. It was, of course, impossible to apply the operation of the quota to them. The ordinance of July 10, 1910, therefore, classed all such schools with those institutions which conferred no rights on their students upon graduation. The purpose of the latter measure is clear. It was dictated by the desire to prevent the Jews from obtaining an education, and in particular to deprive them of any incentive to do so. There seems to be little doubt that the argument used by the Ministry to justify the quota in Russian schools—to prevent overcrowding by the Jews and to avoid inconveniencing the Christian children—could not be applied in dealing with schools for Jewish children only.

This latest line of action in the history of anti-Jewish legislation, based on the acknowledged struggle against the education of the Jews, found its most striking expression shortly before the outbreak of the Great War after the appointment of M. Kasso to the office of Minister of Education. The decision of the Council of Ministers, sanctioned by the Emperor on March 11, 1911, extended the operation of the quota to the Jews who entered for final examinations as external students. This measure was so obviously a violation of the basic provisions of the Russian law that it gave rise to an interpellation in the State Duma. "Jews who enter for final examinations as external students," so runs the interpellation, "carry on their work outside the schools, and being admitted to examinations cannot possibly cause any inconvenience either to registered students or to external students who are not Jews." At the same time, the authors of the interpellation very properly pointed out: "The decision of the Council of Ministers of March 11, 1911, which does not follow either the letter or the spirit of the law, by a mere order of the executive deprives a large number of Jewish students of the right to obtain the certificate as to their educational achievements to which they are entitled by law." The interpellation had no practical results and produced little effect on the Ministry of Education, which ordered the ordinance to be put into force at once.

In order to understand the full effect produced by the decision of March 11, 1911 upon the destinies of Jewish youth one should remember the great part played in their education by out-of-school study. Refused admission to secondary schools with the introduction of the quota, they had been allowed merely to take the examinations as external students. It was natural, therefore, that in every town

or small settlement, especially within the territory where Jews were allowed to reside, the predominating type among the young men interested in acquiring an education was that of the Jewish external student. "M. Kasso may very properly celebrate his victory," wrote the Jewish paper *Novi Voskhod* in April 1912. "He has succeeded in breaking down the zeal of Jewish youth in its struggle for a university education, and the external student has practically ceased to exist. News is arriving from various towns in the area where Jews may reside, that whereas formerly dozens of Jews used to take the examinations, now only one or two are being admitted."

Just as important in the struggle against the education of the Jews was an ordinance of M. Kasso dated November 13, 1911, providing that the quota should be applied to children promoted from the preparatory to the first class of the gymnasia. But the principle of a crusade against Jewish education was perhaps still more cynically demonstrated in an ordinance issued toward the end of 1912 which provided that the quota of Jewish students should be filled by lot, and not in accordance with their standing on the list of candidates who had successfully passed the examination. The fact was that, in spite of the attempted strict enforcement of the quota principle, the number of Jewish pupils in almost every school managed somehow to exceed the prescribed ratio. Naturally, this fact, familiar to every teacher, could not escape the attention of the Ministry. The curator of the educational district of Vilna stated in his report for the year 1896 that the excess of Jewish pupils over the number allowed under the quota "is explained by the fact that Jewish children are admitted to school by competitive examinations which require high average marks, and therefore those Jewish students who pass the examinations are well prepared and relatively gifted; this standing, coupled with hard work, helps them to carry on their studies to a successful conclusion. They seldom leave school before graduation, whereas the number of Christian students who abandon their studies before completion is considerable." The ordinance of the Minister of Education on admission by lot was intended presumably to achieve a twofold result: to lower the actual percentage of Jewish pupils in secondary schools, and to close the door to education to the most gifted and hard-working Jewish boys.

The gymnasia, the pro-gymnasia, and the *real* schools were not the only secondary schools where the Jewish quota was in force. In No-

vember 1909 a similar fate befell commercial schools. From 1896 to 1908, when the harbingers of the coming restrictions first appeared on the horizon, the central Government, in the person first of the Minister of Finance and later in that of the Minister of Commerce and Industry, displayed complete tolerance toward Jewish students. The actual proportion of Jews in commercial schools grew as high as 50 per cent. Many of the commercial schools, the number of which was growing rapidly, especially in the area where Jews might dwell, were financed by local merchants, the majority of whom were Jews. This is the reason why the ordinance of the Ministry of Education of November 6, 1909, which applied the already familiar provisions of the decision of August 22, 1909 of the Council of Ministers to commercial schools, was equivalent to a death sentence on those schools. In addition to the statement that the decision of the Council of Ministers of August 22 was extended to include the commercial schools, in violation of the statutes which had previously been sanctioned and of the clear provisions of the law, the numerous petitions of various merchant corporations were correct in maintaining that the restriction of the right of Jewish children to enter commercial schools was against the interests not only of the Jews, but also of the Christian students of such schools, which were now in danger of being closed. The negotiations with the Ministry now begun by the founders of commercial schools, however, had only one result: that the enforcement of the quota should be brought about gradually and not abruptly.

Of all the secondary schools the gymnasia for girls alone remained outside the scope of the quota, and if one overlooks certain abuses by the local administration the situation there may be regarded as normal.

The ordeal of the Jewish boy was not over when he was admitted to school. The author of a well-documented book published in 1914 was quite right when he said: "The Jewish boy was in an inferior position when he took his entrance examinations, and he remained in an inferior position even after he was admitted."[9] Jewish students had to produce evidence that they were entitled to live in the region where the school was situated, not only at the time when they entered the school but continually throughout the whole course of their studies,

[9] S. Posner, *Evrei v obshchei shkole* (*Jews in Russian Schools*), St. Petersburg, 1907.

and were liable to deportation if their parents for one reason or another were no longer permitted to live in the district. The years which followed the liberal movement of 1904-1907 brought, among other things, a stiffening of the control over the right of residence of Jewish students. The executive officers of the provincial administration were placed in charge of the enforcement of this measure. The Ministry of Education, however, considered it necessary to order that the school administration should include on the students' cards information as to the legal status and domicile of their parents.

On May 8, 1908, the Ministry of Education, on the initiative of the Ministry of the Interior, advised school authorities that in organizing students' excursions to places of interest, they should obtain beforehand the permission of the local administration, if Jewish boys were included in the party. About the same time the curators of various districts revived the antiquated and long forgotten ordinance of Delyanov prohibiting Jewish boys tutoring Christian children. This ordinance was enforced with particular vigor in the district of Kiev, where Jews were not permitted to coach Christian children for even the elementary schools.

But besides such official measures which made a Jewish boy a kind of outcast among his schoolmates, the general atmosphere of national intolerance which often prevailed in the State schools created a very difficult situation for Jewish students. Up to the very outbreak of the War the Russian and Jewish papers were full of information as to the anti-Jewish outbursts of school authorities and teachers. Such occurrences as the compulsory seating of Jewish boys and girls apart from the other students; prohibiting them from taking part in the school celebrations of the abolition of serfdom (February 19) under the pretext that it was purely a Russian national holiday; or the advising of Christian pupils, by a headmaster himself, to break off all relations with their Jewish classmates—were unfortunately by no means the exception in the State secondary schools.

The policy of the Government on the question of secondary education for Jews was, naturally, bound to lead to very definite results. To begin with, it affected the number of Jewish students in secondary schools. The reduction in their number became apparent immediately after the introduction of the Jewish quota. In four educational districts where necessary data are available for five years preceding and five years following the introduction of the quota, the variations in

the number of Jewish pupils in gymnasia and pro-gymnasia are as follows:

Educational district	*Number of Jewish pupils*		*Decrease in second period*	
	1882-1886	*1887-1891*	*Number*	*Percentage*
Warsaw	1378	798	580	42.1
Vilna	1254	616	638	50.9
Kiev	945	774	171	18.1
Odessa	2417	1258	1159	47.9

In the following years, in spite of the increase in the number of schools, the number of Jewish students did not rise above the figure of the pre-quota period in the above-mentioned educational districts, with the exception of Kiev, where the growth of the number of secondary schools was unusually great. There is [illegible] doubt, on the other hand, that the educational needs of the Jews could but increase if only because of the natural growth of the Jewish population and the consequent augmented number of children of school age. The increase or decrease in the percentage of Jewish students in the secondary schools after 1891 as compared with the period 1882-1886 may be seen in the following table:

Educational district	*1892-1896*	*1897-1901*	*1902-1906*
Warsaw	—50.4	—19.1	—2.4
Vilna	—61.5	—53.9	—48.3
Kiev	—24.2	—4.1	+40.4
Odessa	—63.5	—61.1	—43.5

It is easy to see from these figures how many Jewish children wanted to enter secondary schools but were prevented from doing so by the quota. Unfortunately we have no data which show the total number of Jewish children to whom secondary education was denied throughout the whole period of the operation of the quota. However, though our statistical information is meager it is nevertheless sufficiently eloquent.

During the period from 1890 to 1904, the applications of 12,000 Jewish children were rejected in the educational districts of Vilna and Kiev alone, and the proportion of rejections increased in marked degree from year to year. The number of such rejections was 200 in 1890, 1,260 in 1900, and 1,927 in 1904. In considering these figures one should remember that many Jewish parents, realizing the full

difficulty of getting admission for their children into secondary schools and anticipating a failure, did not even attempt to enter their children for the entrance examinations.

There is little doubt therefore that the Ministry of Education succeeded by means of a policy of obstruction in hindering the intellectual progress of Jewish youth and in condemning it to spiritual starvation at the very moment when it longed and sought for an education.

Upon the rising generation of Russian youth the moral effects of the restrictive measures were just as harmful. During the years when the character of a child is in process of formation and is particularly sensitive to external influences the pupils of secondary schools were constantly given object lessons of injustice and hatred of those of their classmates belonging to a different religious denomination. The spirit of religious and racial intolerance, the gospel of hatred, the division of the students into two groups, one enjoying full rights and the other outcast, in a number of cases was bound to demoralize and debase the outlook of school children who had not yet attained the power to resist evil influence. A school which is founded on principles of oppression is a very imperfect instrument of education. It is equally capable of creating a deep feeling of resentment on the one hand, and a habitual tolerance of flagrant injustice on the other. In certain respects such a school is a source of weakness for the State rather than of strength.

On occasion even the officers of the Ministry of Education considered it their duty to warn the head of the Department of the inevitable results of his policy of "education of the non-Russian subjects of the Russian Crown." In the year 1899, M. Popov, Curator of the Educational district of Vilna, wrote in his official report: "My observations lead me to conclude that the secondary schools of the educational district which was placed in my charge are generating and favoring the growth of religious and racial separatism extremely dangerous from the educational, but still more from the national point of view."

To be sure, the policy of the Ministry of Education toward non-Russian school children did not always lead to a division of the student body into antagonistic racial groups. Not infrequently the flagrant injustice of certain measures resulted in a feeling of solidarity instead of an artificially stimulated feeling of aloofness and

contempt for certain members of the class. The concerted protests of whole classes against the actions of an anti-Jewish teacher, the refusals on the part of the boys to take part in excursions from which their Jewish classmates were excluded, these and similar occurrences were common in the secondary schools. But even in such cases the policy of repression ripened into an evil fruit: it created in the rising generation a feeling of animosity toward the teachers and a spirit of protest against a school and régime, which wounded the hearts of children and filled them with indignation.

If the anti-Jewish policy of the Ministry of Education had a highly detrimental effect, the same may be said about the like attitude of the Government toward other non-Russian school children. The position of the Jews in the Russian schools is merely an example which illustrates and brings out with greater emphasis the same features which characterized the position of all non-Russian students, whether Armenians, Georgians, Lithuanians, Poles, or others. Although the quota was not applied to them, one may nevertheless maintain that it was by no means indifferent to them. It legalized, so to speak, the hostile attitude toward non-Russian students and could be used in a somewhat vague way as the justification of the extension of such policy.

Russian schools, especially those situated on the outskirts of the Empire, were officially directed that their main objective was to serve the purpose of Russification. That this was the definite purpose of the schools may be seen, for instance, in the fact that in the southwestern provinces the salaries of teachers were increased for the reason that in those provinces the teachers had to carry on an additional and highly important task, the Russification of the foreign element of the population.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the position of all non-Russian students in the Russian schools was frequently similar to that of the Jews. Not only were they forbidden to use their native tongue in classes, but they were not allowed to use it even during the intermissions between classes. One might give numerous instances of the expulsion of children from the secondary schools in the Polish provinces because they were found talking Polish to their classmates. The unjust and contemptuous attitude toward non-Russian school children, the use of offensive nicknames, the advice given Russian children to keep away from them, etc., are just as typical of the position

of all non-Russian children in the Russian schools as it was of that of the Jews. Naturally, like conditions led to like results.

It was, therefore, not without good reason that the curator of the educational district of the Caucasus, in his official report for 1898, wrote that the Russian schools of the Caucasus are not only incapable of fulfilling their mission of Russification, but as a result of a mistaken policy in matters of education "the estrangement of the native and Russian populations will increase from year to year and may eventually lead to a complete demoralization of the Caucasus." If the responsible officers of the Ministry of Education were under the necessity of expressing their opinions in such fashion, public opinion as to "education of the non-Russian population" was hardly less severe in criticizing the policy of the Government. The Ministry of Education could depend very little on the support of the community at large in its policy of persecution of non-Russian school children.

In defiance, however, of the paralyzing school policy of the Government in the decade preceding the War, there grew up and flourished, supported by public sympathy, a new type of secondary school, which was distinctly removed in spirit from the trying routine of the government secondary schools. Russian educators devoted much knowledge and enthusiasm to the cause of secondary education during these years. Their labors were not in vain. Eminent educators applied themselves to this task; various teachers' associations and educational organizations, supported by the general public, achieved marked progress in the domain of secondary education. Among the teaching staff they stimulated a keen interest in the varied and serious problems of education, and created a number of secondary schools that may indeed be called model. The private secondary schools founded by the endeavor of certain individuals, organizations, and associations served as laboratories, wherein the newest methods and principles of education and teaching were worked out and experimented on. In them the dry formality so characteristic of the government schools was completely done away with, and the relations between teacher and pupil were reformed on the basis of respect on the one side, and a humane and benevolent attitude on the other. The development of self-expression in a pupil became one of the principal objects of the new education; while he was also called

upon to take an active share in the school work, the lessons themselves being rendered much more vital, interesting, and comprehensible.

The general impetus given to education by private enterprise called forth an unprecedented amount of new and interesting text-books, school appliances, pictures, etc.; school excursions, concerts, and entertainments multiplied rapidly; pupils were encouraged to form museums and natural history collections, to decorate their class rooms, to organize, under the guidance of the teachers, all sorts of social and sports clubs, to publish school magazines, and so on.

Even with regard to their administrative organization, the new schools, without formally infringing the rules laid down by the Ministry, were able to depart from the prescribed model. Being keenly alive to the importance of close coöperation between the family and the school, the promoters of the new education practically restored the parents' committees under the name of "hot luncheon clubs," or in some similar form to which the Ministry could take no exception. The careful selection of the teaching and the administrative staffs freed the school board from the autocratic control of the headmaster, a position which in some schools even became elective. In certain cases the prescribed methods of recording by marks the pupil's progress could be altered, as well as the grouping of subjects in the various classes.

It goes without saying that private schools were not in a position to solve problems the decision of which came within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, however much they might have them at heart. The Jewish quota in particular was an irrefutable *vis major* for the new school, but at least private schools did not tolerate within their walls anything that could hurt or offend Jewish children; they took no account of "non-Russian pupils," but treated all their students in a like manner.

Mistakes were naturally unavoidable in this search for something new and better in the sphere of education. In certain private schools, the interests of commercial profit sometimes led not only to shortcomings, but to serious and deliberate delinquencies; but as a rule, the new secondary schools furnished the soil from which sprang the regeneration of secondary education in Russia. Subsequently, when Count Ignatiev was in office, the services rendered to national education by these schools were fully recognized by him and by the reformed Ministry.

Thus, in the main, the progress achieved by the secondary schools lay not so much in an increase in numbers, though some results in this direction were obtained between 1911 and 1915, as in a raising of the standard. In spite of unfavorable external conditions, the Russian cultured classes, by means of various organizations and through persons directly concerned in educational matters, succeeded in creating a system of secondary schools, which though not numerically large, was morally vigorous and whose spirit was in no way inferior to that of the best schools in western Europe.

The conclusion to be drawn from the general state of primary and secondary education in Russia in the years immediately preceding the War is that throughout the history of Russian civilization never was the spread of education so rapid as during the period in question. Certainly not all the obstacles in the path of a normal development of education were removed by 1914. The chief obstacle consisted in the policy of the Ministry of Education, which was still open to serious criticism; nevertheless there were grounds for hope that those sections of the public which stood out as the champions of enlightenment would find sufficient energy to achieve their end and bring the primary and secondary schools to the desired standard.

The goal to be attained was fully realized by the Duma, the zemstvos, the various teachers' unions, and the educational and general publications. The creation of a uniform school from the lowest to the highest grade, the introduction of universal primary education, the enlargement of the secondary-school system, the closer cooperation between the home and the school, the revision of courses of study, the wholesale reform of the system of moral and intellectual education, the creation of an adequately trained and economically independent educational staff, and last, the effective decentralization of the functions of the Ministry of Education among local self-governing bodies, public and educational organizations—such were the fundamental principles, which, in the opinion of educational workers, it was necessary to put into practice without delay.

CHAPTER II

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECTS OF THE WAR ON PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

1. *The War and the Primary Schools in 1914-1915.*

The War, owing to the magnitude of the effort that it involved, soon made its influence felt, both in town and country, to the most remote districts of the Russian Empire.

The mobilization on an unprecedented scale of all the personal and material forces of the country, the enthusiasm aroused in all classes of the population, the uninterrupted stream of news from the front—all these factors tended to create an atmosphere hitherto unknown. The bulk of the male population was called to the ranks; the farms were left to the care of the women and the old men of the families; newspapers and other periodicals began to reach districts where their existence had hitherto been hardly known; letters from the men on service provided a direct and vivid history of current events; finally, a radical change was taking place in the old and familiar conditions of life, and indications were not wanting of the advent of a new economic order.

When all around were stirred by the spirit of war, lived only in the thought of it, when even the remotest village had sent its manhood to the front, and thus was bound to it by the closest of ties, it was inevitable that the War, with its attendant complex experiences, should affect also the mental outlook of the children.

When the winter term started, the child who then returned to school was no longer the child who had left for the summer holiday. He was now forced to grow up more quickly. He, like his elders, must bid farewell to those departing for the front and must experience cruel moments of separation; he too heard the endless discussions and arguments on the progress of events; he too listened to the reading of letters from the front; while the aching in his heart made him only too conscious of all that was happening.

Letters written by the children to those at the front, letters received by them from the army, their school essays and drawings, the

observations made by the teachers, as well as the replies sent in by parents and teachers to inquiries conducted by educational periodicals—all this placed at the disposal of educational workers and writers a rich and varied material to aid in forming a judgment of the effects of the War upon the psychology of the child.

In reply to an inquiry a teacher of a village school, situated ten versts from a railroad station, writes: "The first question I was asked by the children on my return to school at the end of August was a question about the War." They wanted to know whether one ought or ought not to fight. The question asked of the teacher of the village of Sosnovka was by no means an exception. In villages and towns the War had captured the imagination of the children. This is the unanimous conclusion of the authors of numerous articles on war and the child, war and the school, peasant children and the War, effects of the War upon the psychology of the child, and so on, which continually appeared in the columns of educational periodicals and which were based on information coming from all parts of the country.

The conception of war which the children of elementary schools made for themselves was not infrequently very naïve. It is well expressed in the impatient exclamation of a pupil in a village school: "Why do they fight so long? Why don't they meet in an open field, have a good fight, and then forget all about it?"[1] War, as a complex and manifold phenomenon, was entirely outside the children's grasp. They usually thought of the War in concrete and tangible terms; they pictured it as two rows of fighting soldiers. "War has come," they said gazing at a passing detachment of soldiers.

But nevertheless, their knowledge of facts relating to the War was amazing. This is clear, for instance, from drawings made by school children. They registered in them their impressions of the events about which they learned from the newspapers or from letters written them from the army. We find them picturing Belgium and Lodz, the Carpathian Mountains and the forests of Augustovo, the Dardanelles and the capture of Lemberg, English aviators and the Ger-

[1] E. Zvyagintsev, *Otnoshenie detei k voine* (*Children and the War*), in *Vestnik Vospitanya* (*The Messenger of Education*), 1915, No. 4; *also* J. E. Potemkin, *Otrazhenie voini na detskoi psikhologii* (*The War and the Psychology of the Child*), in *ibid.*, 1915, No. 8, and Y. J. Yaroshevich, *Selskaya shkola i voina* (*The Village School and the War*), in *ibid.*, 1916, No. 2.

man underground telephone, naval battles and poison gases, etc. These drawings themselves and, still more, the explanations of them by their authors throw a considerable light on the effects of the War upon the children's minds. When children write under pictures they have drawn: "an abandoned house, the owner is in the army," "in Belostock children were going to school when a German aeroplane flew over them and killed them all," "wounded men are transported in a boat and the rushes bow to them"—one can hardly deny that these legends are full of deep meaning.

The children's games were also affected by the War. It is well known that children, and especially boys, are always fond of playing at war. But now such games not only crowded out all others, but also began to follow certain definite patterns embodying the knowledge the children had acquired about the events at the front. "Sham battles," writes a teacher of the province of Voronezh in reply to an inquiry, "are now the favorite pastime of the children." "As soon as the children leave the school," writes another teacher, "they divide themselves into ranks of 'Russians,' 'Germans,' 'Austrians,' and 'Turks,' and then begins a most noisy fight which goes on until both sides are exhausted." The games next in favor were the building of fortifications and playing at doctors and nurses.

Military subjects became the chief themes of essays written by children on topics of their own choice and of plays of their own composition produced in the schools. And, finally, conversations and questions to the teachers, even after their first curiosity had been satisfied, continued to turn on the same subject until the very end of the school year. For instance, soon after the teacher of the Sosnovka village school went home for the Easter holiday of 1915, she received the following letter from her pupils: "Yulya Nikolaevna, we have read here that the Germans have been blown up by a mine in the Baltic Sea and that 70,000 of them have been drowned. Please reply to us." From that date and until the end of the teacher's holiday she continued to correspond with her pupils who insisted on having answers to questions dealing with military events and even world politics.

The ultimate effect of the War upon the children's minds was, of course, exceedingly complex. "The outlook of the children is dominated by the sad, horrible, and depressing side of events and, in spite of the relatively high ethical level of the children's minds and their

sensitiveness to what is right or wrong, their essays often betray considerable cruelty."[2] When a boy of ten writes to his correspondent at the front: "Pick them up (the Germans) on your bayonet or rifles! Don't spare them. Rip them up! Rip them up like dogs!" he only repeats what was said at that time in hundreds of letters written by children. "I should love to kill twenty Germans," writes a boy on *What I should do if the Germans attacked our village*, "and after that I shall be still more ferocious." It is true that a different state of mind may occasionally be observed among the pupils of elementary schools. In their essays one may find expressions of sympathy even for the Emperor William, on whom the animosity of the children was usually concentrated. In his essay *The Russians have entered Berlin*, a boy says among other things: "And the unfortunate William has hidden in a dark corner; he cries, 'Oh, dear,' and thinks, 'What a fool I was to start this struggle. How sorry I am now.' " But such feeling of sympathy with the enemy was an exception in the general run of children's work of that period. At any rate, cruelty and a desire for revenge were not the only ideas brought to the children as a result of war experiences.

The conversations, essays, and drawings of the children and their letters to those in the army are filled to the highest degree with affection for the Russian soldiers and interest in their condition. "I am thinking about the War," writes one boy, "of how they are fighting over there. Snow, cold and frost." "I am thinking," writes another boy, "of how our soldiers are getting on and where they are." The affection of the children for the soldiers sought expression in their desire to help the men in the trenches or those who were under treatment in the hospitals. The making of warm clothing and underwear had taken hold upon the village from half-blind old women to the children. "Even boys," writes a teacher, "insist upon taking part in the work, have armed themselves with needles, and are making puttees. After class work is over they sit at their desks and sew or help in whatever way they can, in finding needles and thread, etc." The same children on the initiative of the teacher several times sent their

[2] S. Levitin, *Krestyanskya deti i voina* (*Peasant Children and the War*), in *Russkaya Shkola* (*The Russian School*), 1915, Nos. 9, 10; also *Otrazhenie voini v zhizni shkoli* (*Effects of the War upon School Life*), in *ibid.*, Nos. 11, 12, and F. Zenov, *Voina i deti selskoi shkoli* (*The War and the Children in Village Schools*), in *ibid.*, 1916, No. 12.

drawings and other work to the parents' committee of the neighboring town to have them sold for the benefit of war orphans. Children were particularly intent on writing letters to the front, containing advice as to how the fighting should be conducted; they treasured the replies they received, and read them over and over again.

It is worthy of notice that in spite of the multitude of new impressions the children not only kept their former interest in their school work, but in certain cases were even more keen on it. "I am conducting three or four classes," writes a village school-teacher. "Lessons in geography and history are more vivid than they have ever been before. The maps have now acquired new and fascinating interest. The children are deeply interested in the customs and circumstances of the belligerent nations."[3] Similar information on the increased interest of children in school work was to be had on all sides.

Educational news in the columns of the more influential publications[4] showed how fully the importance of the new problems which now confronted the schools was realized. Under the prevailing conditions the schools had to bear new and grave responsibilities.

Educational workers insisted on the necessity of starting school attendance at a much earlier age than had hitherto been the practice.[5] They thought it expedient to carry out a peaceful academic mobilization simultaneously with the military one. With the departure of the men, the children to a great extent were left without supervision. It seemed only natural that the burden of the extra care and superintendence of the children should fall on the school. At the same time it was considered advisable that the spontaneous enthusiasm of the children should be turned to good educational advantage.

The new world-wide ideas in the spheres of history, geography, and ethnography, as well as others that were now abroad, might of themselves, if skilfully treated by the teacher, be made to give valuable assistance in carrying through the term's work successfully. By this means the school could, to a certain extent, protect the children from false impressions and inaccurate judgments, as well

[3] E. Zvyagintsev, *op. cit.*

[4] *Vestnik Vospitanya, Russkaya Shkola, Narodni Uchitel, Shkola i Zhizn, Pedagogicheski Vestnik, Vestnik Obrazovanya, Izvestia Vserossiskago Pedagogicheskago Obshchestva,* and others.

[5] Cf. *Vestnik Vospitanya* (*The Messenger of Education*), 1914, No. 9 *sqq.; Russkaya Shkola* (*The Russian School*), 1914, Nos. 9, 10, 11 *sqq.*

as from the debasing influence of the fury of the world conflict, which might exercise a generally unfavorable effect upon the child's spiritual side, and might, in particular, as the result of tales of cruelty and atrocities, arouse answering feelings of revenge. The words of one of the most famous of Russian educators, M. Ushinsky, spoken many years before as to the possible evil effects of war on the psychology of the child, were now considered by many as a timely and pertinent warning.

The leaders of the Russian educational movement, writing in the pedagogical periodicals, expressed their dissent from those who—often very loudly—asserted that the diversion of energies to a purely cultural purpose might impair the success of the military operations, and that all thoughts must now be concentrated exclusively on helping the men who were fighting for their country, and supporting their families.[6] They, on the contrary, held that there was sufficient energy both for the War and for cultural work. The object of the school, after the War, was to heal as quickly as possible, by its work of enlightenment, the wounds inflicted by the War. The teachers and workers in the sphere of education must be called upon to display exceptional energy, otherwise public education and the interests of the State closely connected therewith would be seriously endangered. Besides carrying out its primary functions, the school was necessary for the adult population of the village. The villages, and especially suburban localities, were inundated with a flood of penny newspapers, new books of war songs, satires, verses, stories, and pictures displaying an extraordinarily flippant attitude toward the War and the acute difficulties to which it was giving rise.

All these wide-spread publications, which had once before been thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the people, during the Japanese war, not only failed to give an accurate presentation of the actual course and significance of current events, but were also completely out of harmony with the serious concentration and religious exaltation that were characteristic of the village mind. It thoroughly bewildered the common people and made them view with suspicion and skepticism everything that appeared in print. The village teacher, by talks and lectures to the adult population, freed from the rival attraction of the closed public house, could solve the problems that

[6] Cf. *Shkola i Zhizn* (*School and Life*), October-November, 1914; *Vestnik Vospitanya*, 1914, No. 6, etc.

troubled them and correctly explain the meaning of what was happening.

There were circumstances, however, which from the first made it doubtful whether the school and its teacher, under the stress of war conditions, would be found equal to the severe demands inevitably made upon them. As early as the beginning of the academic year 1914-1915, the primary schools were considerably hampered by the fact that the ranks of the elementary school-teachers were much depleted by the mobilization. The law relating to conscription, though lenient to secondary school-teachers—for those on the permanent staffs of the secondary schools were exempt from service, gave no privileges to the primary school-teachers.

According to the statistics published by the Ministry, the number of primary school-teachers at the beginning of the year 1914-1915 was 56,000. From information collected by some of the district zemstvos, 50 per cent of this total were temporarily absent owing to the War. Besides the teachers themselves, candidates for teachers' positions aged nineteen and over, who had completed their course at the teachers' training colleges, were also mobilized. As a result, a great number of primary schools had to be closed. Naturally those that suffered most were the one-class village schools, which had only one teacher—that is to say, the most popular and best-attended type of primary school. Individual zemstvos made efforts to secure exemption from mobilization for teachers and to obtain the return of those already mobilized. But their petitions were not given favorable answers by the Government until toward the end of the school year. Owing to the lack of coördination among the zemstvos, many of these did not even contemplate the possibility of such petitions, much less that they would meet with success.

Thus, the exemption from mobilization of primary school-teachers and the return of those mobilized during 1914-1915 did not affect the majority of schools, and in any case did not take place until toward the end of the academic year. Accordingly the War dealt the primary school a blow where, even in normal times, it was most vulnerable. Hurried measures had to be taken to replace the mobilized teachers, who were often men of great experience and who possessed a thorough knowledge of the peculiarities of their school, by persons who not only took up the teaching profession for the first time, but, what

was even worse, were in the majority of cases entirely unprepared for the work they were about to undertake.

The Ministry, in spite of its strong inclination to curtail expenditure on education, after taking into account the difficulties experienced by the schools owing to the lack of sufficiently well-trained teachers, deemed it expedient to open in 1915 twenty new colleges for the training of primary school-teachers and five colleges for the training of teachers of elementary schools of higher grade.

The district zemstvos, in their turn, on the strength of the data in their hands, undertook, during the autumn session of 1914, a series of measures designed to help as far as possible the teaching staff, to improve its educational standard, and to increase its numbers. With these objects in view resolutions were passed at the general meetings of certain district zemstvos concerning the foundation of teachers' training centers, school libraries, the organization of teachers' conferences, and the organization of supervision of the schools by the zemstvos, as far as was permissible within the narrow limits prescribed by the ordinances of the Ministry and the Senate.[7]

All these and similar measures had, doubtless, a certain positive influence on the organization of education in the primary schools; time must elapse, however, before any results could become apparent, besides which these measures were adopted only by a minority of the zemstvos. At the time when a school began to experience acute difficulties owing to the depletion of its teaching staff, the population, carried away by the significance of current events and new emotions, began to evince a specially keen interest in it. A considerable number of children, wishing to enter the schools, were refused admittance owing to lack of room. The percentage of children not admitted, according to statistics supplied for the provinces of Kiev, Chernigov, and Perm, as well as for a few others, was very high, from 40.9 per cent to as much as 79 per cent. The Ministry meanwhile, as also the zemstvos, fearing material obstacles, began either to curtail their subsidies for the development of the schools, or to retard the allotment of already sanctioned estimates.

The total of the credits opened for 1914 was, according to the estimates of the Ministry 169,579,399 rubles. In consequence of the outbreak of hostilities, however, the sums already assigned by the Ministry were curtailed by 14,286,954 rubles. Thus, according to

[7] The Supreme Court of Russia.

the Ministry's figures, only 155,892,445 rubles were granted. The reductions affected chiefly the primary schools, as follows:

	Rubles
Upkeep of primary schools	6,000,000
Increase in salaries of staff	250,000
Building of new primary schools	600,000
Continuation of buildings begun	50,000
Replenishment of the school building fund, grants for the building of schools	5,184,000

The total curtailment, in connection with the War, of subsidies for the purpose of primary education, amounted in the first month of the War to 12,084,000 rubles.

When submitting the estimates for 1915 for the sanction of the Legislature, the Ministry stated that it had taken into account both the extraordinary circumstances created by the War, and also the reductions made in the estimates of the previous year. "The financial burden laid on the Treasury," so runs the explanatory memorandum, "could not but occasion an extensive reduction in the estimates of the Ministry for 1915."

Of the total estimates of the Ministry for the year 1915, 62,490,560 rubles were assigned for the purpose of the upkeep of the primary schools and for other needs of primary education, as against 68,855,099 rubles assigned by the preliminary estimates of 1914. Of this sum 52,456,560 rubles as against 61,001,897 rubles in 1914 were for the actual upkeep of the schools. The credits for this purpose in the earlier year, had, as we know, been curtailed by 6 million rubles, that is, they were actually 55,000,897 rubles. Still, even as compared with the curtailed estimates of the previous year, the Ministry applied in 1915 for an even smaller sum. For the introduction of universal education, the Ministry asked 3 million rubles, that is, a sum practically equal to the amount spent on this service in 1914. Finally, for replenishing the school building fund and for grants for the building of schools it demanded 5 million rubles, that is, 2,416,000 rubles less than the amount actually assigned in 1914. Thus in 1915, once more, the chief reductions in the estimates of the Ministry of Education were effected at the expense of primary education.

When considering the projected reductions in the estimates of the Ministry of Education for 1915, we must bear in mind that the total

estimates of all government departments taken together were computed to be 230 million rubles less than the approved budget of 1914. The Ministry of Education bore almost 10 per cent of the reductions, whereas its budget represented only 5 per cent of the expenditure for all departments, which, in normal times, was 3,310,000 rubles. Thus, the Ministry, having regard to the war conditions, resolutely on its own initiative embarked on a policy of cutting down its own expenses, and accordingly abandoned the scheme for developing primary education. It did not take into account the fact that the cause of education was the cause of the future, and that any serious obstacles placed in the path of national education would inevitably make themselves felt for years to come.

The Duma, however, did not consider it possible to go as far as the Ministry wished in the matter of curtailing the estimates for education. True to its already well-founded traditions, the Duma voted for 1915 more than was demanded by the Ministry. As a result, the estimates for 1915, as compared with those adopted for 1914, were curtailed not by the approximate sum of 23 million rubles, as the Ministry proposed, but by 10.5 million. The estimates in fact showed an excess of 3.7 million rubles on the sums actually granted by the Treasury for 1914. As a result of this alteration in the estimates, the sums assigned for primary education were increased by the Duma. The estimates of 1915, as finally sanctioned, put the credits for the replenishment of the building fund at 10 million rubles. The sum, however, granted for the development of universal education was not increased as compared with the original estimates, notwithstanding that the experience of the previous year had shown that the restriction of the credit for universal education to 3 million rubles involved a serious check to the future development of the system of primary schools.

One of the most respected Russian newspapers, the *Russkya Vedomosti*, which was connected with academic and zemstvo circles, and was at the same time well known for its calm and impartial attitude, accurately expressed the state of mind of those public circles which were in close touch with the questions of education. It stated among other things that,

> The sum needed for the satisfaction of the most important cultural needs of Russia is absolutely negligible when compared with the expenditure incurred and about to be incurred for war purposes. . . . We

must not forget that it is necessary for the greatness of Russia that the plans for universal education should be unceasingly pushed forward towards a rapid realization, for the ignorance of the masses is a source of weakness and not of strength.

Concurrently with the reductions in the departmental estimates, the zemstvos, in their turn, began to review their estimates and to arrest the building of new schools; to refuse, in the spring of 1914, to replace absent teachers; and to cancel the opening of new school units and libraries. Measures of this kind gave ground for fear that at the coming autumn sessions, when the estimates for 1915 were to be examined, the tendency toward reduction of educational expenditure would become general.

The very first session of the zemstvos, which took place in September and October 1914, to a certain extent justified the apprehension of imminent reductions in the zemstvo subsidies for educational purposes. The zemstvos had to prepare their estimates under strong departmental pressure. The Ministry of the Interior was the first to suggest that the zemstvos should curtail their share of government subsidies. The Ministry of Education and the Department of Agriculture and Land Settlement in their turn issued ordinances authorizing reductions in public expenditure on schools and agriculture. The Ministry of Education laid down that,

> In view of war conditions, no grants or subsidies, except those already authorized, shall be issued for building purposes to the primary schools. Such institutions as have received only part of their grants must arrange for the completion of their buildings on that basis, without counting on any additional sums, whether in the current year, or in 1915. Those towns and zemstvos whose petitions have not, as yet been granted, must regard them as refused. . . . In the coming year, 1915, the local bodies must not count on receiving new grants for the purpose of universal education.

The resolute tone of the ministerial ordinance could not but affect the zemstvo estimates. It did not, however, completely disorganize the educational work of the zemstvos, though it caused a marked diminution in its intensity, and the subsidies granted by the zemstvo meetings for educational purposes varied greatly in different parts of the Empire.

Certain of these bodies vigorously opposed any reductions what-

ever in this sphere, and, on the contrary, sanctioned educational estimates which were higher than those of the preceding year, even though this necessitated considerable economies in other directions. The zemstvo of the Ryazan district, which increased its educational estimates by over 10,000 rubles as compared with the preceding year, adopted as the watchword of its session "Staunchly to maintain intact, in spite of the difficult times, all the educational work which, during the half century of its existence, the zemstvo has carried on." The Balakhny district zemstvo, in the province of Nizhni-Novgorod, declared educational measures to be "urgently needed, while any delay in this sphere is dangerous."

Certain other zemstvos also adopted this point of view. But even this reasonable attitude toward the problems of elementary education did not suffice to save in these zemstvos the cause of the further normal development of universal primary education. Other important and unavoidable expenditure by the zemstvos in connection with elementary education was closely bound up with government subsidies and grants. The zemstvo estimates, even though they were increased, could not make up for the absence or insufficiency of the government grants.

Under the stress of war conditions and the curtailment of government grants, other district zemstvos, and these were the majority, found it necessary to diminish their own expenditure in the matter of schools. Unfortunately, information as to the total sums assigned by the zemstvos to education for the year 1915 is not available. But an estimate of the reduction made in zemstvo grants for primary schools can be made from data collected by various provincial zemstvos. Thus, according to figures supplied by the Ryazan provincial zemstvo, in the eleven district zemstvos of that province the total reduction in the budget for education amounted to 244,000 rubles.

In this province the chief reductions were made under the heads of construction of new school buildings and of opening new establishments and new schools. The attention of the zemstvos, accordingly, was mainly directed to the maintenance of the already existing schools, but even in this direction certain of them endeavored to cancel whole series of grants, often quite negligible in amount, running from 200 to 300 rubles. The state of the finances of the province of Ryazan and the degree of development of the schools in that province present no exceptional features.

If we take the above reductions as typical of all the provinces, we find that the total sum of reductions in the zemstvo educational budgets would amount to between 8 million and 9 million rubles, that is to say, would be about equal to the final departmental curtailment under the head of primary education in 1915 as compared with 1914.

What principally suffered as a result of the reductions in departmental and zemstvo grants was the development of school construction. Indeed, in the majority of zemstvos the building of new schools was stopped for a year. From the report on the position of the school building fund and on the issue of grants for the construction of primary school premises, appended to the estimates of the Ministry of Education, we can clearly perceive the crisis that arose in this connection in 1915.

Year	*Number of grants*	*Total value (in rubles)*
1910	163	1,953,550
1911	212	4,310,160
1912	282	6,423,810
1913	348	7,366,164
1914	432	9,617,962
1915	238	7,065,401

Thus the continual and at the same time considerable increase both in the number and in the total amount of grants for school buildings suffered in 1915 an abrupt and violent check. In that year 190 grants were issued to the zemstvos, and 44 to the towns, and as some zemstvos received two or three grants, only 177 zemstvos altogether, considerably less than half the total number of district zemstvos, considered themselves in a position to undertake school building, even on a reduced scale.

Further, the opening of zemstvo schools of a higher grade ceased altogether. In spite of the ever increasing need for two-class primary schools, the zemstvos, at their autumn sessions of 1914, postponed the actual opening of such schools until a more favorable moment, even when it had previously been decided on.

The teachers' conferences and courses also suffered from the reductions in the zemstvo estimates, though the already apparent disorganization in the sphere of education peremptorily called both for the coöperation of the pupils among themselves and for the maintenance of the teaching staff up to the required standard. Only in particular cases were the zemstvos at their autumn sessions of 1914

prepared to open new departments for national education under the auspices of the zemstvo executive boards. The Rybinsk district zemstvo, in view of the mobilization of the officials connected with education, deemed it necessary even to close its already existing department. Thus, as we have pointed out, the general intensity of development of universal education was diminished. Out-of-school education suffered less, by comparison, from the reductions in the estimates. A considerable fraction of the zemstvos realized the great increase in the educational needs of the adult population, and showed less reluctance to assign grants for libraries, popular readings, lectures, Sunday schools, exhibitions, museums, and educational cinemas than for primary instruction. The annual sessions of the provincial zemstvos, which took place after the district sessions, followed their lead. At the same time, these paid much attention to the problems of national education, and fully realized the importance and expediency of the quickest possible development of universal education in Russia. In view of the extreme shortage of funds, however, they were forced to abandon new projects in that sphere, and even to postpone another series of schemes that had been previously prepared.

Thus, as a result of the very first few months of the War, and of the practical difficulties apprehended in connection with it, the cause of national education in Russia suffered serious prejudice.

The disorganization, however, that we have noted in the primary schools in 1914-1915 was accompanied by phenomena of an opposite nature. The beginning of 1915 was marked by an event that greatly raised the hopes of those sections of the public that were directly interested in the cause of national education. This was the appointment of Count Ignatiev to the head of the Ministry of Education, in place of M. Kasso, who had died.

Public opinion, as expressed in influential circles and in the general press and in special educational periodicals, showed surprising unanimity in its view of the change that had taken place. Once again the old policy of the Ministry was resolutely condemned. The following appeared in an educational review:[8]

M. Kasso had no part in creative work, and if during his term of office certain positive reforms were passed, such as the law on universal

[8] *Vestnik Vospitanya,* 1914, No. 9.

education, we must give the credit for these improvements almost wholly to the initiative of the best of the educators and to the support of the general public. Even in these matters the part played by the Ministry was, in most cases, a negative one.

The appointment to the Ministry of a man well known for his useful work in another department gave grounds for hoping that the differences between the views of the Ministry and those of the public, so prominent during the last Minister's tenure of office and undoubtedly one of the fundamental reasons of the Ministry's more serious failures, would at last cease to exist.

An overwhelming majority of the provincial zemstvo boards were among those who were first to realize the full importance of the change which had taken place, and they hastened to approach the new Minister with suggestions for various changes in elementary education. These petitions were surprisingly uniform. However, there was not, nor could there have been any preliminary agreement by the various provincial zemstvos as to the nature of their suggestions. Thus the petitions of the zemstvos, all directed as they were to the one purpose, were more than ordinarily impressive. It was clear that the questions now brought up for consideration had for some time been sources of genuine concern for the large majority of zemstvo workers, and that the former policy of the Ministry of Education had long been considered by those immediately connected with popular education as one of the chief obstacles to the spread of elementary education. When the zemstvo of Kiev petitioned the Minister to discontinue "the abnormal state of affairs" which allows the inspector of elementary schools to appoint or dismiss on his own authority the teachers in zemstvo schools, to suspend the decisions of the school boards, to authorize or prohibit the opening of school libraries, while the zemstvo boards were not permitted to take any part in the organization of educational work, nor summon teachers to their meetings,—this petition embodied the same demands which are found, with a slight change in wording, in the petitions of the zemstvos of Ufa, Vyatka, Kerson, Kostroma Tver, Nizhni-Novgorod, Ryazan, Taurida, Smolensk, Perm, Moscow, Vladimir, Orel, Orenburg, Tambov, Kharkov, and others.

Simultaneously with their protest against the various decisions of the Senate and ministerial ordinances, which they regarded, as the zemstvo of Kiev put it, as "the result of action taken directly by the

Ministry of Education without regard to existing laws," the zemstvos indicated such measures in the sphere of national education as, in their opinion, should be put into force at the earliest possible opportunity. Of these first and foremost in the opinion of the zemstvo of Ufa was the "prompt preparation and submission to the Legislature of the draft of an organic law concerning education, on the basis of the bill on primary schools passed by the Third Duma, and in accordance with the desires expressed at the first All-Russian congress on primary education."

We do not doubt that if effect had been given to these and other similar petitions of the zemstvos, which were in full agreement with the views of Russian educators and were put forward by all the zemstvos, they would have led to the definite development and expansion of primary education in Russia. With the appointment of a new Minister such a consummation did not seem at all impossible.

Thus primary education, in spite of the shocks experienced during the first few months of the War, was left not wholly without hope for the near future. Many persons cherished the belief that there would be improvement if not in the actual numbers of schools, at least in the quality of those already existing, and in their effectiveness in combating the ignorance of the masses. There was some foundation for the view expressed from the tribune of the House by the author of the report of the Duma Committee on national education—a view widely shared by the public—that "at last a fount of living water has burst forth in the Ministry of Education."

2. The War and the Secondary Schools in 1914-1915.

The academic year 1914-1915 in the secondary schools was marked by considerable change. We may divide the secondary schools into four groups in respect of the direct influence which, during the first few months of the War, the actual or possible proximity of the front had upon them.

To the first group belonged the schools of those regions, which in the course of 1914-1915 were in the actual theater of war. Among these were the schools under the control of the Warsaw educational district, the majority of the schools in the educational districts of Riga and Vilna, part of the Kiev educational district, and a few of those of Odessa and the Caucasus. The board of the Warsaw educational district was transferred to Moscow, and the schools under its

control in part ceased their activities, and in part were evacuated to different towns, where they found premises for continuing their studies in the buildings of State and private schools during the vacant hours. A majority of the former pupils of these evacuated schools likewise left the threatened zones. They did not, however, in all cases remove to the same towns to which their schools had been transferred. As was natural, they accompanied their parents and not their school. The evacuated school, bereft of most of its pupils, sheltered under a distant roof, forced to carry on its work in evening hours to which its teachers were unaccustomed, was but a mere ghost of its former self.

To the second group belonged the schools of the regions that lay close to the theater of war. These schools, though not as yet evacuated to other towns, were under the imminent threat of evacuation. This group was chiefly composed of the remaining schools of the educational districts of Vilna and Riga and to some extent of that of Kiev. The conditions under which these schools worked were undoubtedly extremely hard. Under the ever present threat of evacuation and its consequent disturbance of their normal life teacher and pupil alike could evidently not pay that attention to school work which is its due in normal times and circumstances. The center of interest had shifted, and the mental atmosphere was entirely unsuitable for school work.

The third group comprised the schools of the adjacent region. In this were included part of the Petrograd, the whole of the Moscow and Kharkov, and the more eastern parts of the Kiev and Odessa educational districts. The schools of this group became the chief refuges of the evacuated schools. In many schools of the central regions, especially in the capitals, the number of refugee pupils received as supernumeraries was very large. In individual schools, such newly received pupils numbered 50 or even as many as 100. The work in such overcrowded schools could be carried on only at the expense of much of its utility.

Finally, to the fourth group belonged the educational districts of Kazan, Orenburg, and Siberia, wholly removed from the sphere of war, and but little affected by the evacuation of schools near the front. To this group we may add the schools of the northern part of the Caucasian educational district. As regards the work of these schools, it proceeded normally, with the exception of some slight dis-

turbance occasioned by the mobilization of teachers not on the permanent staff.

The obstacles to the progress of education caused by the evacuation of schools were not the only ones; similar difficulties arose from the commandeering by the authorities of school buildings for hospital, depot, and other purposes. The requisition of school buildings in the first few months of the War assumed very large proportions. It was frequently conducted entirely without the knowledge of the educational authorities of the district. In the exhaustive memorandum appended to the estimates of 1916, the Ministry took a very serious view of the difficulties encountered by the schools in the year 1914-1915, owing to their evacuation, to the uncertainty of their situation, to lack of accommodation, or to excessive overcrowding.

The War was not slow to affect ministerial estimates for secondary schools in 1915. The total assigned for boys' and girls' schools in that year was 29,303,267 rubles, including the cost of the government schools, the grants for both boys' and girls' secondary non-government schools, and the teachers' increments of salary under the law of May 10, 1912. The estimates for secondary schools were 1,783,267 rubles higher in 1915 than in the previous year. This increase, however, was much smaller than the normal growth of the secondary-school budget in the years immediately preceding. Thus in 1912 the increase in the secondary-school budget had been 6,388,161 rubles, and in 1913 6,631,745 rubles. In 1914, after allowing for the reductions in grants actually made, occasioned by the War, it was 2,312,301 rubles.

The Ministry itself, when presenting the scheme of estimates to the Legislature, acknowledged that the strain on the public finances necessarily called for the utmost retrenchment in the departmental expenditure in 1915. It considered it possible to include in its estimates only those grants whose omission would cause serious detriment to the cause of education, a consequence not justified even by war conditions. This enforced economy became a serious obstacle to the further development of the system of secondary schools. In 1915 provision was made for opening only 8 new gymnasia and 6 *real* schools, whereas in the preceding years the Ministry opened on an average 34 State schools a year.

Apart from the external difficulties which beset the normal course

and development of secondary education, the War itself rapidly affected the internal life of the secondary schools.

The rich and varied information contained in the answers sent in by parents and teachers from all over the country to an inquiry published in November 1914 in a number of educational periodicals makes it possible for us to obtain some knowledge of the effects of the War upon the psychology of pupils in the secondary schools.

"War, as may be expected, produced a stronger impression upon children living in towns than upon those living in the country, and among the former a stronger impression upon children living in large cities than on those living in small provincial towns."[9] The senior pupils of secondary schools were now often compelled to think about complex problems which under normal conditions would have been beyond their grasp. The more mature among them, those belonging to the better educated social groups who had more of an opportunity to follow world events and to observe the reaction of them upon their elders, were prone to such valorous discussions as the responsibility for the War, the relative merits of Germany, France, Great Britain, and Russia, the respective values of the civilization of those countries. They drew plans for the defeat of the enemy, drafted conditions to be embodied in the future peace treaty, and remodeled the map of Europe. But generally speaking, the pupils of secondary schools reacted to the War in a manner similar to that of the pupils of elementary schools. This is of course particularly true in the case of the junior pupils.

"My boys are in a state of perpetual war," writes a mother. "The roof of the new attic is their favorite position. . . . Their games are full of hatred and violence." "The games of my boys," writes another mother, "have undergone a complete change. Travels, boats and buildings have now given place to war, the siege of fortresses, the mining of bridges, of fortifications and ramparts. In response to the news of the capture of Tsing-Tao they at once proceeded to the erection of the fortress, its noisy capture and destruction, and then came a triumphant procession with songs and banners through all the rooms, their faces radiant." An exhibition of children's drawings held in Moscow fully supported the view as to the popularity of military subjects.

The spirit of animosity toward the enemy was as common among

[9] E. Zvyagintsev, *op. cit.*

the pupils of the secondary schools as it was among those in elementary schools. When a mother reports that her boy, eleven years old and a pupil in a gymnasium, "builds prisons for Germans and erects gallows on which to hang them," she gives a vivid illustration of one of the fundamental conditions of the state of the children's minds at that time. "My son, now in the sixth year in a gymnasium and one of the best students in his class," writes another mother, "continues to dwell each day on the destruction of traitors. His eyes flash when he hears the news of the sinking of a German cruiser or of some other loss suffered by the enemy. Among the children the hatred of Germany is growing day by day. Today, for instance, they have decided to petition the school authorities for the removal of their German teacher and the discontinuance of their German lessons." The children of the junior year of one of the *real* schools were asked in 1914 to write a paper on the topic, "My wishes for the New Year." A great many of them replied with bad wishes for William. "I wish William and his sons would become ill." "I want to strangle, to hang William." Perhaps the kindest of them was the following: "I should like to make William a prisoner and put him in jail as an ordinary citizen, and not to hang him, as Grigoriev suggested."

The writers on educational problems did not fail to realize the increased susceptibility of the pupils in secondary schools, and they emphasized the duty of the teacher in dealing with the new and infinitely complex educational problems brought forward by the War. "The teacher should always keep in mind and spare no effort to safeguard the rising generation from evil and corrupting influences," said an educational periodical, "and to bring it up in the spirit of real freedom, good will and other high ideals which are leading human thought along the road of civilization and progress."[10] These views represent the traditional attitude of the foremost Russian teachers, who were always suspicious of the official patriotism and chauvinism which were so carefully cultivated among the pupils of the State schools. And if the German, and especially the Prussian school, took an active part in the development of nationalistic and militaristic aspirations, the progressive section of Russian educators, on the contrary, were certainly not guilty of any such crime.

But the same periodicals naturally could not fail to record that

[10] *Vestnik Vospitanya,* 1914, No. 6; *Srednya Shkola i Zhizn,* etc.

side by side with the undesirable effects produced upon the pupils by the War there were also developments of a very different nature for which the War was responsible.

Those who had an opportunity to study the highly interesting records of the inquiry on the effects of the War upon the minds of the pupils, among other things came to the unanimous conclusion "that the school work in gymnasia has not been neglected, but on the contrary it has profited by the general enthusiasm."[11] "Children prepare their lessons with enthusiasm and real pleasure" and are delighted to have "so much interesting work."[12] The new emotions and feelings due to the War became closely associated in the minds of the children with their academic work. "Dear mother," writes a senior in a gymnasium for girls, "we now have a tremendous amount of work to do. Latin and mathematics are very interesting. Do you know how many sets of underclothing we made last week? 538! We have already finished Latin grammar. . . . Aunty is to work in a hospital. In November I have to read a paper on history. . . . We are working in the junior class-room. . . . We have made bed linen for one hundred hospital beds. Such a lot of interesting work." Not less typical is the letter of another schoolgirl: "Dear mother, father and brothers, . . . I have important news for you. To begin with I have received 5 (full mark) in a test in logic and 4½ for my Russian paper. In our Latin course we have started Julius Caesar. Then we, that is the three senior classes, are working for the Red Cross. I made three shirts last week. . . . You would not know our lazy class. We all prepare our lessons every day. Our papers for the Russian course were turned in on the day set for them. Such a thing never happened before. We never miss a test. In our spare hours we sew, or work with the juniors."

The teachers in the secondary schools were also impressed by the increased tempo of school work at that time. "We have reports from numerous teachers," runs an editorial in *Vestnik Vospitanya*,[13] "that school boys and girls are now working with greater energy than ever before; teachers in charge of the conduct of the pupils inform us that the behavior of the latter is much more serious and restrained, that the maintenance of discipline is now easier, that the number of

[11] *Vestnik Vospitanya*, 1915, No. 4.
[12] *Russkaya Shkola*, 1915, No. 7-8.
[13] *Vestnik Vospitanya*, 1915, No. 9.

punishments has decreased. . . . If the younger generation is now seeking protection from increasing anxiety in the company of their teachers, the teachers are also beginning to develop that interest in their pupils, that benevolent tolerance which was the dream of Russian public opinion throughout the many years of its struggle for a better school." Educational journals thought it their duty to emphasize the fact that at such a time there could be no question of a formal attitude, of a bureaucratic and pedantic disregard of the psychological conditions of the school children.

It was in this way that there gradually developed that normal academic atmosphere without which the respect of the pupil for his teacher and the moral guidance of the pupil by the school are equally impossible. The barrier which in the past had separated the teacher from the pupil began to crumble away. The influence of the teacher who undertook to explain to his class the real meaning of current events was greatly increased. Greater interest in school work and a like concern about military events helped to build ties of closer understanding between the teacher and his pupils.

Quite aside from the new psychological conditions and intellectual interests, the War created a very natural desire among the pupils in the secondary schools to take an immediate part in the military events themselves. Such a desire was spontaneous and even inevitable; war, like any other important event, has a great power of attraction. To ignore such desires, or to attempt to deal with them by methods of obstruction would undoubtedly be a manifestation not only of narrow pedantry, but also an unforgivable error from the educational point of view. It is true that this desire, or some aspects of it, not infrequently assumed most unattractive forms. The press contained increasingly frequent reports of cases where pupils in the secondary schools, with, or more often, without the consent of the elders, left school and attempted to reach the front. The practice of running away from school began in the very first months of the War. Telegraphic inquiries were made along the railways for boys of from ten to eighteen years of age from Serpuchov and Rybinsk. In Moscow, during the early part of the school year 1914-1915, eleven cases were recorded of the unauthorized flight of pupils to the front. At Sebastopol, a considerable group of boys of the senior class of the *real* schools left with a similar intention; while at Saratov all the pupils of the senior class of the technical school enlisted as volunteers.

Similar information was received from Poltava, Odessa, Kherson, Theodosia, Yaroslavl, Kostroma, Kaluga, Tashkent, and many other towns. The fugitives included girls of the senior classes of the gymnasia. The majority were made to return from various points on the journey, but there were a few "lucky" ones who were able actually to reach the theater of war. These remained there for a few months, and took a direct part in the fighting and some even received military decorations for bravery.

It is difficult, no doubt, to suppose that these boys were all of them actuated by serious or rational motives. The running away of boys of from ten to fifteen years of age, especially, might well be the result of flights of the imagination, which at other times also prompted certain boys to try to run away to America in search of adventure. Such escapades, however, were never before so numerous and popular as they now became. Formerly they had been mere episodes, but after the outbreak of the War they assumed the importance of a real problem.

The educational writers resolutely condemned such a misapplication of the energy of boys, as yet undeveloped, both physically and morally.[14] Apart from the direct effect of the severity of war conditions on immature physical organisms, the spiritual well-being of the boys might be very seriously impaired.

The conference of teachers of the secondary and primary schools and of educational publicists, called in 1914 in Petrograd to discuss the educational problems to which the course of events was giving rise, came to the conclusion that

> School-teachers, though welcoming the honest and healthy desire of the children to show their personal interest in current events, must themselves, in their own earnest and active participation in what is happening, exercise all their authority to direct this desire into channels best suited to the physical and moral progress of the children. The influence of the horrors that invariably accompany war, affecting as it does the susceptibilities not only of children but of adults, and deadening their feelings and sensibilities, must be counteracted as much as possible.

In their opinion regarding the attempts of pupils to go to the front, the school workers did not stand alone. Such an authoritative

[14] *Russkaya Shkola,* 1914, No. 9-10.

military paper as *Russki Invalid* declared that the desire of schoolboys to go at once to the War must be curbed in every way. "When they finish school, these young men will be of use to Russia. We must not encourage the escapades of boys desiring to join the army, even if these originate from a noble desire of service."

The runaway schoolboy who had been at the front, on his return to school, became a person of importance. By the tales of heroic exploits and bloody encounters, by the descriptions of horrors and destruction, even by the newly assumed appearance of nonchalance, by the forcible vocabulary learned at the front, and by his freshly acquired experience of life, he affected and stirred the imagination of his classmates, and distracted their attention and interest from school work in a manner dangerous to their immature minds and wills. Often, in spite of his enhanced authority, the teacher was quite incapable of standing up against this returned runaway, especially if the latter, as sometimes happened, had been decorated. This created for the teacher an additional inducement to help his pupils in their desire to find an outlet for their emotions and feelings in activity, as long as such activity could be coupled with the idea of self-sacrifice in relief for the victims of the War. The secondary-school pupils, with the unqualified support of the school authorities, took an active part in helping the men at the front and in succoring the wounded and the sufferers by the War. In this sphere, the girls rivalled the boys. In nearly all the girls' schools the pupils at once set to work to make clothing for soldiers at the front. Both boys and girls were energetic in promoting street collections and in circulating notices of all kinds of contributions, theatricals, or concerts, the proceeds of which were to be devoted to the hospitals or to the purchase of gifts for the men at the front.

This sending of presents and also the writing of letters to soldiers were especially popular among the school children. The presents were chosen and packed with loving care, each letter received in reply was treated by all the class as a great event, and was at once made known not only to the rest of the school, but also to the teachers. The pupils showed a marked ingenuity in obtaining funds for these gifts. It goes without saying that they themselves gave freely, and eagerly helped to organize all kinds of entertainments; but in addition they had recourse to methods of self-taxation entirely unknown to any financial science. Thus, the pupils of the senior class of the

Vladikavkaz *real* school arranged a system of fines for various misdeeds for the benefit of the wounded. Again, those late for prayers were fined two copecks, those late for school three copecks; for a bad mark the fine was four copecks, but those receiving the highest mark were also taxed, and at the highest rate—five copecks. In many boarding schools the boarders gave up their dessert for the benefit of the wounded and the soldiers at the front; those who smoked were allowed by their comrades only as many cigarettes as they sent to the front, and so on.

The pupils of the secondary schools, in their spare time, often took an active part in the transportation and tending of the wounded. For this purpose complete medical squads were organized in various secondary schools under the supervision of the school doctor. In regions situated nearer the front, such squads rendered extremely valuable assistance in the work of tending the wounded, as was testified both by hospital doctors and by the heads of various zemstvo and civic organizations. All this, in the end, not only did not impede the school work, but gave the pupils much moral satisfaction, led to the growth among them of a spirit of unselfishness, and gave them an experience of social work and discipline. The useful results obtained from these associations of schoolboys furnished additional proof of the error of the educational policy involved in the earlier government attitude of distrust of the pupil and suppression of his wish for individual active work. We do not doubt that, even in normal times, beneficial results would have been obtained if pupils had been encouraged to organize themselves in societies for self-instruction, sport, etc., or if they had been entrusted with the supervision of the school libraries, of the laboratories, of the physical training, etc.

The Ministry of Education, in view of the exceptional conditions, did not, as it was wont to do, endeavor to hinder the pupils from organizing themselves to help the victims of the War; rather, it encouraged such proceedings by a series of ordinances. The new Minister, Count Ignatiev, went much further. He sanctioned the formation, during the summer holidays, of schoolboy farm-labor squads, for the purpose of helping those families which, owing to war conditions, were without their chief support. We cannot regard this decree of the new head of the department as a mere acquiescence in the needs of the times: its author had doubtless, besides purely practical considerations, serious educational problems in view. The idea itself

of pupils' labor clubs met with a mixed reception from the public. That part of the press which regarded everything from the optimistic standpoint of officialdom pointed to these labor squads as a means of overcoming the labor shortage in the villages. The balance of the press was inclined to treat the scheme with sarcasm. It doubted if inexperienced schoolboys would be able to afford real help to the country at a time when such help ought to have been obtained by more serious and radical measures.

The first experiment in schoolboy labor squads was unquestionably, in many ways, not a success. Certain teachers, however, who had been with such squads seem to agree that no book could have given the town boys so much food for thought and feeling as those few months of labor in rural surroundings; and that no theoretical preaching about helping one's neighbor could have had so deep an effect as the very fact of rendering that help and of seeing its practical results.

It was only necessary, in order to secure the future success of the squads and to save the generous enthusiasm of youth from being wasted, that account should be taken of the mistakes made during the first experiment, and arrangements made, first, that the work of the schoolboys should be supervised by competent men, and secondly, that they should have the assurance that they were helping not the richest members of the community, but those who were most in need of help.

The Acting Minister, temporarily in charge of the affairs of the Ministry of Education (pending Count Ignatiev's appointment), Baron Taube, influenced presumably by the above considerations and by the words of the ministerial ordinance issued as early as July 1914, that "All forces must be bent to the defense of the country, and the younger generation must participate in the work," set out to encourage the temper of the youth, and issued toward the end of 1914 an ordinance authorizing the arrangement in January of early examinations for pupils of the three senior (sixth, seventh, and eighth) classes of the secondary schools who wished to enlist. Such early examinations could only be taken with the consent of the boys' parents.

If as regards the eighth class, in which the second half-year consists in review and the pupils are sufficiently mature, such a measure was not free from criticism, as regards the seventh and still more the

sixth class, it was undoubtedly a grave error. Even in respect of the eighth class, it would have been wiser to stipulate that the early release of pupils was to be determined not by examinations hurriedly arranged, and thus reduced to a mere formality, but by the estimate of the pupil's progress formed by the school board. In practice, very few took the examinations in January 1915. At most there were two or three boys per school; in many there were none at all.

With the other measures that were an outcome of this new state of mind of the pupils, we must evidently class the exceptions and exemptions from former regulations granted by the Ministry in the course of the school year 1914-1915 to those entering or leaving the schools. The general effect of these measures was to relax the ordinary formalities, which were wholly out of keeping with the intensified eagerness of pupils and teachers alike to participate in the work of the nation, and also to abolish the restrictions imposed on Jewish children, the crying injustice of which became the more apparent in wartime, when all alike, regardless of race, were called upon to do their duty to their country.

Even M. Kasso in August 1914 issued an ordinance to the effect that "pupils of Jewish religion from schools that have been closed owing to war conditions may, in the course of the current school year, be admitted into other schools, even if the latter have no vacancies for Jewish pupils, provided that the interests of Christian children are not thereby prejudiced."

The necessity for making such modifications in existing regulations, which admitted equality of responsibility but not the equality of rights, furnished an excellent example of the serious practical defects of these regulations, patently obvious even to their supporters. But under the restrictions imposed by M. Kasso, the position of Jewish children whose fathers were at the front was in no way improved. The children of a Jew, if he were killed or wounded, might enter a school only within the quota and, what is more, not on the basis of the marks obtained in examination, but, under M. Kasso's regulation, by lot.

Later, in May 1915, the new Minister, Count Ignatiev, permitted children of Jewish fathers, who had distinguished themselves or had been killed or wounded, to enter the schools not by lot, but by position on the list of marks; they were still admitted, however, only within the Jewish quota.

At the end of July 1915, at the instance of the Minister of Education, the Government sanctioned the unrestricted admission to the schools of Jewish children whose fathers were serving in the army. The new Minister, so far as we can judge from his whole action and the views he expressed, was unable to approve of the disabilities from which the Jews had hitherto suffered in this respect. Owing to general political conditions, however, even his influence was sufficient only to modify the existing regulations, not to secure their complete repeal.

The other amendments of the regulations made toward the end of the school year by the Ministry were still less important. They related chiefly to the conditions under which the final examinations might be taken. But even here small changes were indications of a new policy. Former Ministerial ordinances had shown marked distrust of the school boards, and had entrusted the fundamental control of the school to the authorities of the educational districts and of the headmasters. In connection with the final examination, the Ministry had until recently clung to the old formal method of testing the pupils' knowledge. If the marks received for written papers fell below a certain standard, the candidate was completely and absolutely barred from admittance to the oral examinations, even if the school board, aware of the pupil's real knowledge, were unanimous in their opinion that the failure in the written papers was accidental.

The new Ministry, in opposition to the ordinance of M. Kasso, left the admission of a pupil to the oral examinations entirely in the hands of the school board, subject to the provision that an illiterate Russian essay was to exclude a pupil absolutely.

At the same time, the final examinations in private schools "with privileges for the pupils" were also placed on a proper basis. In these secondary schools, the actual examinations, the setting of subjects for written papers, and the marking of the papers, used to rest entirely with the representative of the Ministry of Education, that is, a person specially appointed by the educational district for that purpose, who was entirely unacquainted with the pupils and the treatment of the subject in the school. As a result, the candidates in such schools were always liable to be the victims of chance and were at the mercy of arbitrary treatment on the part of the examiner. According to the new ordinances of Count Ignatiev, the setting of examinations in private schools with privileges for pupils was placed

in the hands of the teaching staff of the school, while the deputies were entrusted with their proper duty—that of supervising the formal correctness of the proceedings.

Further, the new ministerial ordinances gave the school boards the right, which they hitherto lacked, of permitting pupils who had failed in the spring final examinations to take them again in the autumn.

The school year 1914-1915 ended, in accordance with the decision of the Ministry, a month earlier than usual. This decision was apparently based on the supposition that, owing to the prevailing conditions, pupils would find it difficult to apply themselves to study. In fact, it could hardly be regarded as expedient, since it cut short the normal school work and handed over the pupils wholly to the care of their parents, already burdened with worries due to the War, and gave the children excessively long holidays, during which they were not under the influence of the school itself and were bound to forget much that they had learned.

Thus, the War laid its mark on the secondary schools even in the very first year of hostilities. Not only those schools which had suffered directly from current events, from closing down, evacuation, requisition of buildings, overcrowding with refugee pupils, etc., but every single secondary school without exception, had felt its consequences. A new psychological atmosphere was developing in them. The self-organization of pupils had noticeably increased and had already borne useful fruit. The relations between teachers and those taught had also improved. The old formalism was replaced by more human relations. In this sphere, the War was the external force that gave the impetus necessary to start the school on the path of progress which had already been recognized by leading educational and public circles as the only normal and expedient course in any circumstances. New ideas as to organization, connected with these internal changes, were in the air and had already affected the secondary schools.

The reaction of the War upon the pupils, however, had also given birth in the secondary schools to phenomena that could not be regarded as desirable. The problem of moral education was thereby rendered much more difficult. Both the school authorities and the central administration under Count Ignatiev were zealous in their search for a solution.

From a purely educational point of view also, the school year 1914-1915 left a sufficiently complex legacy behind it. The mere fact

that school work had ceased a month earlier than usual was bound to affect the program for the coming year. Moreover, a scheme of reform propounded by the new Minister, which was radically to change the constitution of the secondary schools, was in contemplation. Several features in this reform, for example, the six-year period of the school course, and the separation of the senior classes according to the special subjects taught, demanded a certain change in the character of the work prior to the final adoption of the reform.

It had also to be borne in mind that the War might affect the schools still further and that many more of them would be faced with closing down, evacuation, requisition, further overcrowding, etc. The rise in prices and the multiplication of financial difficulties, had not, as yet, had any marked effect on the internal life of the secondary schools; nevertheless these difficulties, especially for private schools, already began to be regarded as a possible menace for the future.

Against the background of all the difficulties occasioned in school life by the War, the need for the long expected school reform, which under the new Minister was nearing its realization, stood out all the more clearly.

CHAPTER III

THE GROWING INFLUENCE OF THE WAR ON EDUCATION

1. *The Primary Schools from the Autumn of 1915 to 1917.*

The further course of events considerably increased the troubles to which school life had been exposed from the first months of the War.

The high cost of living and the insufficiency of the material resources of both school and school-teacher became more and more pronounced as the War progressed. Even such a seemingly trivial matter as that of school equipment began to cause grave anxiety in zemstvo and teachers' circles. The ordinary grant for equipment—1.25 rubles per pupil in one-class schools, and 2 rubles in two-class schools—became wholly inadequate even at the beginning of 1916, owing to the increase of 125 per cent in the price of the equipment. It began to be feared that schools would lack the necessary supplies of paper, copy books, pencils, and ink. The problem of obtaining school requisites, which was not raised by the zemstvos until the autumn of 1915, and not even then by all of them, arose with such suddenness that its solution became a matter of extreme difficulty.

The position of the primary school-teachers, owing to the increase in the cost of living, was especially critical. It had always been disquieting; it now became positively disastrous. The basic teachers' salary of 30 rubles a month, at a time when the cost of the necessities of life had increased two or threefold, was manifestly inadequate not only for a married man, but even for a bachelor. The high-cost-of-living bonus of approximately 10 rubles per month granted by the Ministry and the increase of the teachers' salaries by 10 to 20 per cent, arranged by certain zemstvos and municipal organizations, afforded some relief, but did not materially alter the situation. Teachers wrote frequent letters to the press, complaining bitterly of their situation and soliciting advice. The position of the refugee teachers from regions occupied by the enemy was even worse. The Ministry suggested to the curators of educational districts that they should open primary schools for refugee children, and appoint evacuated teachers to such schools. In practice, however, the organi-

zation of special schools for refugee children was very difficult. Moreover, during the evacuation, the primary school-teachers had scattered in various directions; the school authorities did not know their whereabouts, while the teachers themselves could not find their superiors. Neither the Ministry nor the educational districts knew for certain how many teachers had been evacuated and to what places, or how many had remained at their posts.

The straits to which the primary school-teacher was reduced further increased the instability of the school staffs, to which reference has already been made, even in those schools which were situated far from the front. Cases of resignation of teachers became more and more frequent. The tendency was for teachers to obtain factory or other manual work, whereby their material condition would now be considerably improved.

The Moscow Committee of the All-Russian Pedagogical Society called upon the public and the Government in an earnest appeal to turn their attention seriously to the difficult situation in which the primary schools were placed. The Committee wrote:[1]

> The resignation of teachers due to war-time conditions, a course to which many, and that by no means the worst members of the teaching profession are resorting, will inflict incalculable damage on the cause of education. It is precisely in these difficult times that every grain of culture must be jealously guarded; each school closed down provides an open field for barbarism and ignorance. . . . The school and its work in its entirety must be preserved in the interests of the life and economy of the country. In order to save the school, however, we must preserve its workers—the primary school-teachers.

There was thus serious apprehension that schools would have to be closed down; while at the same time the desire of the population to send their children to school was even greater than in the previous year. Apart from the direct influence of the War, which increased the public interest in institutions capable of furnishing information and explanation of what was happening, the increase of pupils in primary schools was to a certain extent due to letters from the front, which were received in great numbers in the villages. In the monotonous conditions prevailing among soldiers at the front, the disadvantages of illiteracy must have made themselves acutely felt. The

[1] Quoted from *Vestnik Vospitanya,* 1916, No. 8, pp. 94-97.

fathers at the front insisted more and more that their children should go to school.

In the report of the executive board of the zemstvo of Akhtir (province of Kharkov) the following extract is quoted from a letter received in the village from the front. "And now, father, will you send Makar and Serge to school. Make them learn, else it will be bad for them some day. If they don't want to, whip them hard and make them go and learn, for it is a bad time for those who cannot write; I myself know now how they live—it is very bad for them." And another letter: "Perhaps I shall have to leave my body on the battlefield, so I ask you to teach the children to read and write; whatever happens, and however difficult it may be, they must be taught to read and write."

On the strength of such letters, the mothers sent their children to school, and insisted on their being admitted. According to information supplied by the same board, in a school which in the previous year had had an entry of fifty to sixty, the number wishing to enter toward the beginning of 1915-1916 was over a hundred.

With so great an increase of pupils, the continual slowing down of the development of the network of schools and the check to the building of new schools, owing to the ever growing financial difficulties of the Treasury and the zemstvos, were all the more deplorable. In presenting its estimates for 1916, the Ministry considered itself obliged to "curtail its expenses wherever there was the slightest opportunity for doing so without open injury to the schools." The projected estimates for 1916 totaled 165,159,788 rubles. Thus the Ministry in that year abandoned the idea of reducing its estimates, and presented to the Duma a scheme of expenditure exceeding by 6,244,553 rubles that of 1915, but still less by approximately 4.5 million rubles than that of 1914; the department itself considered the increase of approximately 6.2 million rubles absolutely inadequate, especially in view of the growth of the demands made on the school. Bowing to the exigencies of war-time, it firmly hoped "to take up again, at the first opportunity, a policy of development of the system of schools of all grades."

Under the head of "upkeep of primary schools," the estimates of 1916 showed an increase of 7,359,826 rubles over 1915. This increase was however less than that shown in 1914 (11 million rubles). For the replenishment of the building fund, the Ministry "taking

into account the war-time conditions" demanded only 5 million rubles instead of the customary 10 million.

The Budget Committee of the Duma increased the Ministry's estimates to a total of 195,623,812 rubles. The traditional sum, 10 million rubles, was again assigned to the building fund; while 3.7 million rubles was specially granted for the development of universal primary education. The smallness of this increase in the estimates for universal education as compared with pre-war grants involved a new and drastic check to the development of the school system.

The estimates of the Ministry of Education for 1916 were destined to be the last sanctioned by the usual procedure. The estimates for 1917, owing to the Revolution, were drawn up but never passed beyond this stage.

The department proposed to increase its expenses in 1917 by approximately 18.5 million rubles, as compared with the sanctioned estimates of 1916. However, this increase in the estimates was chiefly occasioned not by a projected development of the school system, but by an increase in teachers' salaries and by general increases in the budgets of already existing schools. For the specific purpose of the extension of universal education, the Ministry asked for only 3,752,000 rubles; while for the replenishment of the building fund, again only 5 million rubles, a substantial reduction, especially if we take into account the enormous rise in the cost of labor and materials.

The insufficiency of the government grants for primary education in 1916 at once affected, as in the previous year, the zemstvo estimates. Again, in August 1915, as in the previous year, the Government warned the district zemstvos that grants for the support of existing and new teaching units, as also for the equipment of schools, would not be made for the rest of the year; while in the following year, 1916, "in view of the fact, that owing to war conditions the estimates have been drastically cut down, the issue of grants for the equipment of new school units will hardly be possible." As a result, the majority of the district zemstvos adopted, even more resolutely than in the preceding year, a policy of retrenchment and postponement in the matter of universal education, and in some cases even brought their work in this direction to a complete standstill. Zemstvo boards that did not adopt such a policy were the exception.

The possibility of a further reduction in the cultural work of the zemstvos became still more evident in their autumn sessions of 1916.

The report of the Melitopol district zemstvo in the province of Taurida offers an example. It presented with especial clearness the effects of war conditions on the educational work of the zemstvos. According to this report, in the latter half of 1914-1915 no new zemstvo school premises were built or new schools organized, whereas under the general scheme for the introduction of universal education 120 new schools should have been opened. In 1915, 3,573 children were refused admittance to the schools; and in 1916, 5,228. In spite of all these refusals, the number of pupils per teacher continued to increase. In 1914 the average per teacher was 50; in 1915, 52; while in 1916 it was 56. The filling of teachers' vacancies was also, according to the Melitopol board, "no easy matter." "It was necessary to make several consecutive appointments to the same post, and even now there are still some vacancies." Owing to the vast increase in the cost of school equipment and labor, the Melitopol zemstvo had continually to incur considerable and unforeseen extra expenditure.

Even under the above conditions, the zemstvos increased their school estimates for 1916-1917, yet this increase was to a great extent absorbed by the rise in the cost of the maintenance of the schools. According to data supplied by the Moscow zemstvo board, those items of maintenance on which in 1915 the zemstvo had spent 389,000 rubles required toward the end of 1916 a sum of 809,000 rubles. The fresh interruption in the development of the school system, the curtailment in the building of new schools, the disastrous material conditions of the primary school-teachers, and the extreme difficulty of supplying the schools with the necessary equipment—in short, the continued decline in the work of the primary schools both as regards quality and amount, were the direct result of the growing influence of the War on primary education.

Besides these consequences of a general character, the solution of particular problems, even though overdue and involving no excessive expenditure, had to be postponed. For instance, the Minister of Education, in an explanatory memorandum attached to the estimates of 1916, pointed out that, although he fully realized the necessity of altering the rules concerning the teachers' training colleges and conferences, he was nevertheless obliged to postpone the measures that he had in view in this connection. For the same reason, war-time conditions, the Ministry deferred to a more favorable moment the

organization of school boards in certain regions, the necessity for which it recognized.

Thus, every year of war involved new and serious obstacles to the development of national education in Russia; and each succeeding year was worse in this respect than the last.

2. The Secondary Schools from the Autumn of 1915 to 1917.

The explanatory memorandum of the Ministry of Education attached to the estimates for 1916 gives a complete and unbiased picture of the state of secondary education in the autumn of 1915. It declares that "the normal life of the secondary schools has been destroyed." During the summer of 1915 many school buildings had been occupied by the army as hospitals, warehouses, and for other similar purposes. Owing to military events, the evacuation of schools assumed, after the summer of 1915, very extensive proportions, and had not yet been completed by January 1916. The measures adopted by the departments to provide for the evacuated schools had likewise not yet been completed. Moreover, the Ministry recognized that the evacuated private schools were in an especially difficult position owing to the fact that they depended on the payment of school fees, and that these payments had now ceased. In view of this, the Ministry deemed it desirable to help the fully privileged schools "as much as possible." Those not possessing full privileges could not hope to get even this rather vague support. The increased size of the classes as compared with the previous year, the frequent necessity of conducting the work in rented premises and with day and evening sessions still further increased the difficulty of the conditions in which many secondary schools were placed during the school year 1915-1916.

From the autumn of 1915 onward the rising cost of living began to affect the secondary schools. After January 1916, the Ministry of Education increased the salaries of those teachers who received less than 200 rubles a month by 15 to 30 per cent, the increase being in inverse proportion to the amount of the salary. This increase, however, was not sufficient and moreover it did not extend to the private schools, the schools of the Department of the Empress Marie, the commercial schools, or to those teachers in government schools whose salaries exceeded 200 rubles a month. Toward the autumn of 1916, the teacher, even with the aid of a bonus, could live in a town on his

salary only by foregoing many of the necessaries of life and completely neglecting all intellectual needs.

If we add to this the shortage of the necessaries of life, the endless lines of people waiting to purchase every commodity, and the ever present anxiety for the morrow, we find such a combination of circumstances as was bound to affect the teacher's output of work, and to lower his interest in his vocation. The external events and conditions inevitably affected the pupils. As before, they were ready to show active and warm sympathy and compassion for those who had suffered by the War. Both sexes were, as before, eager to take part in hospital organizations, victualing squads, assistance to refugees, preparation of first-aid dressings, etc. In Moscow the coöperation of the pupils of all the secondary schools was even organized for this purpose. But, in the course of time, these generous activities lost their attraction as a novelty, and became a matter of routine for many of the school children. In any case, such occupations could not, as before, claim their whole attention. The interest in various problems raised by the War—historical, geographical, technical, and so on—had grown markedly less. The general educational value of such problems, in their time, had been obvious to the pupils. Now that the superficial curiosity had been satisfied few pursued them any farther. The university, which had always exercised a fascination on the secondary schoolboy, was no longer that alluring stage where his status in life was to be determined. Owing to the mobilization of students, academic life began to ebb, the university lecture rooms became more and more empty, and the boys of the senior classes of secondary schools also knew that they, too, were due to be called up in the near future, and that even if they entered a university, it would not be for long. Educational workers began to take note that the interest of the pupils in school work and in serious books was gradually diminishing, while the tendency to carelessness and lack of attention was growing apace.[2]

This state of mind among the pupils was the result of their "increased nervousness," to which the memorandum of the Ministry of Education attached to the estimates for 1916 had also referred, and which rendered them highly susceptible to every sort of influence. Meanwhile there were many factors in public life toward the autumn of 1916 which could but have the worst effect on the schoolboy. The

[2] Cf. *Vestnik Vospitanya,* 1915, No. 8.

chief interest of the public became increasingly centered on questions of high prices, lack of commodities, speculation, etc. From the beginning of the 1916-1917 school year educational workers could note cases where individual pupils had engaged in unprecedented speculation of all kinds. The commodities in which such school trade was usually carried on had to do with the immediate requirements of the students, such as rolls for school lunches, pencils, notebooks, etc. Occasionally, however, they went beyond such needs and included various foodstuffs, cloth, and leather. Such transactions, although by no means of frequent occurrence, were nevertheless typical of the new conditions, because they provoked no protest nor even a note of surprise, whereas they would have been incredible under normal circumstances. It was not without effect that outside the school the increasingly difficult economic conditions of life were evolving a type of man-in-the-street, definitely and cynically engrossed in his own well-being. The school was only reproducing on a small scale what was taking place around it.

There are no data to be had dealing with the increasing mercantile inclinations and breaches of discipline among the students. But they were only too familiar to every teacher. Nor did they escape the attention of the public at large. M. Rusanov, member of the State Duma, discussed them in a speech which was reprinted in *Izvestia Sovieta Vserossiskavo Pedagogicheskavo Obshchestva* (*Bulletin of the All-Russian Pedagogical Society*). "Many of the darker sides of life have been intensified by the War," said M. Rusanov, "and one of them, which has been conspicuous for its foolish expenditure and ostentatious luxury, has contaminated our rising generation. A teacher today has to deal with many phenomena which had no place or were hardly perceptible in time of peace." One of the new curators appointed by Count Ignatiev very properly discovered in the attitude of society itself one of the chief causes for the undesirable changes which were taking place in the psychology of the school child, and he issued an appeal to the public in which he pointed out among other things that "individual manifestations of negative qualities among schoolboys and girls must give rise to a general feeling of sorrow, anger and indignation. . . . Not only parents' committees and teachers, but the community at large must coöperate in the moral and intellectual regeneration of the youth."

Count Ignatiev fully realized this gradual and not always easily

discernible change in the mentality of the pupils, and endeavored for his part so far as practicable to direct their interests into proper channels. The Ministry of Education again issued an ordinance, authorizing the organization of schoolboy farm-labor squads in the summer of 1916; it took into account, however, the faults of organization of the previous year, and emphasized the necessity of each squad having a leader appointed by the local zemstvo board. The Ministry also ordered that the spring months, which, through the abolition of examinations were now unoccupied, should be employed by the two senior classes in military training as a preparation for service in the army, and by the remaining classes in all kinds of educational excursions.

The girls of the senior classes, besides taking part in the excursions, were directed by the ministerial ordinances to acquaint themselves with the methods of instruction in primary schools, with the organization of kindergartens and playgrounds, with the methods of giving first aid in case of accidents, tending the wounded, etc. All these measures adopted by the Ministry, with the exception perhaps of the military training, which in general was practically nowhere organized with sufficient thoroughness, were bound to exercise a useful educational influence on the pupils. However, it was manifestly not within the Ministry's power to alter their mentality, which was closely bound up with the spirit of the public itself.

The difficulties, both external and internal, to which the secondary schools were subjected, forced the Ministry to turn its whole attention to their support, and to relegate to the background any scheme for an increase of their number. In the explanatory memorandum of the Ministry attached to the estimates for 1917 it is stated that: "If in normal times the chief task of the Department lay in satisfying the growing demand of the country for education, in time of war its primary duty is to maintain regular work in already existing schools."

Though in the Ministry's estimates for 1916 the credits for the maintenance of secondary schools were increased by 1,720,938 rubles in comparison with the previous year, to a total of 38,477,337 rubles, yet the extension of the school system was to be limited to the continuation and completion of those schools in which instruction was already being given. In the projected estimates of 1917, the credits for the maintenance of secondary schools were increased by

10,871,000 rubles. This addition, however, was almost wholly devoted to the increase of teachers' salaries and to the ordinary expenditure of the secondary schools, which had greatly increased in connection with the general rise in the cost of living. Thus the comparatively active development of secondary schools observable during the period 1911-1915 had, owing to the War, almost entirely ceased.

In the existing circumstances, the position of both the primary and secondary schools in 1917 could not but occasion grave apprehension. There was of course no question of a complete cessation of the work of education, nor was there any prospect of such a stoppage in the future; but the cause of national education was encountering difficulties both external and internal, and the results that it achieved were diminishing year by year. These, expressed in figures, for the period from the autumn of 1915 to January 1, 1917, were insignificant. The development of universal education suffered a check, owing to the reduction in the grants. The completion of the system of universal education was almost as far off in January 1917 as at the beginning of 1914-1915. The secondary schools newly opened during the above period could be easily counted. Only the moderate increase in the upper primary schools, noticeable during the previous three or four years, did not slacken.

The only educational establishments whose number, in spite of the War, continued to increase rapidly up to 1917, were the teachers' training colleges and schools. These establishments, as also the measures for the promotion of continuation schools for adults, were the successful outcome of the new policy of the Ministry of Education, which, under the guidance of its chief, made heroic efforts to counteract the destructive consequences of the War.

CHAPTER IV

THE NEW SCHOOL POLICY OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

The new policy as to problems of elementary and secondary education, championed by Count Ignatiev, cannot be dissociated from the severe strain imposed upon Russian schools by war conditions and the social upheaval. Undoubtedly the general spirit and trend of this policy should be sought first of all in the deep personal conviction of the Minister that under all circumstances the active coöperation of public forces is necessary for the success of any educational scheme. This conviction allowed Count Ignatiev to construct his plans on a large scale and assured them the confidence of public opinion. But the very fact that the Minister of Education found it advisable to make an open and official statement of his desire to seek the support of public opinion and to coördinate his work with the desires of the legislative chambers and of local government bodies was due to the object lesson taught by the War, which had forced the Ministry of War to appeal for help to public organizations and the Ministry of the Interior to give up, at least superficially, its traditional policy of mistrust of local institutions of government and allow the organization of the Unions of Towns and of Zemstvos. The same conditions made it possible for Count Ignatiev to remain at the head of the Ministry for two years and to carry out his program in an atmosphere of complete aloofness so far as the other ministers were concerned and a conspicuous lack of confidence in him on the part of the ruling bureaucracy. It was only after his withdrawal that it became known that Count Ignatiev had several times offered his resignation, as a result of his disagreement—on questions of school policy—with persons influential in political circles, and that it was only in this manner that he obtained the concessions necessary for the carrying out of his plans. Count Ignatiev had the unanimous support of public opinion, a fact that would have counted against him in pre-war times but which now constituted his strength and made it necessary that due regard should be given to him, at least while the patience of the real masters of Russian politics was still unexhausted.

Aside from the fact that the War and the psychological changes brought about by the War made possible the comparatively long tenure of office of such a man as Count Ignatiev, with a program entirely incompatible with the long established traditions of the Department, the War together with the influence it exercised on various phases of Russian life was the stimulating force behind Count Ignatiev's general plans for reform and the consequent measures. Count Ignatiev himself frequently drew attention in his reports and ordinances to the necessity of giving due regard to the problems occasioned by the War. His conception of the part which Russian schools would have to take in the future well-being of the country was founded on the conviction that after the War the school would become a powerful factor in healing the moral wounds caused by the War. For this reason he was eager to prepare the schools for their coming mission and because of this he took no account of the most venerable and deep-rooted departmental practices when they would seem to interfere with his plans for the improvement of the elementary and secondary schools. In spite of strict measures of economy and unavoidable delays in adding to the number of schools, he spared no expense in his endeavor to create a sufficiently large and properly trained staff of teachers to carry on effectively the work of the schools as soon as circumstances would permit. In spite of his deep interest in the rôle which the schools would be called upon to play in the future, Count Ignatiev did not overlook the small but pressing needs of the moment. All measures issued by the Ministry were directed to supporting educational and public forces, to helping the schools in the difficult period through which they were passing, and to the complete eliminating of bureaucratic form of school organization, the burden of which was especially felt when, under the pressure of events, outside influences were making their way into the schools.

In January 1915, in the Budget Committee of the Duma the new Minister had only to define the foundation of his educational policy. In reply to a question as to his attitude toward the problems of the reform of secondary education and of universal education, Count Ignatiev stated that he considered the introduction of the latter as the basis of all elementary education, and that he quite agreed with many of the criticisms directed against the secondary schools, "having in mind, after consulting the representatives of the people, the

definition of those stages through which the course of education in secondary schools must be guided." Such words from the mouth of the head of the Department were rather unusual under the conditions prevailing in Russia, marking as they did the birth of a new era in the official relations between a representative of the Government and the legislative body. Subsequently Count Ignatiev deemed it necessary to repeat the official statement, that he intended shortly to coördinate the policy of the Department of Education with the wishes and ideas of the legislature and with the activities of the organs of local government, to pay greater attention to communications from pupils' parents, and to render all possible support to social initiative in the matter of national education. The position adopted and maintained by the Minister marked the close of the breach between the policy of the Department and the community, a breach that had been, up to that time, the chief obstacle in the way of the development of education in Russia. It was no doubt to be feared that the subordinates of the Minister of Education, especially the curators of educational districts, might be unable or unwilling to put unreservedly into practice the ideas which, to their surprise, the central department had adopted. The only sure means of establishing a proper equilibrium in the matter of school administration was the reform of the local authorities.

At the beginning of 1915, the question of the reform of the central and local organs of the Ministry was laid before the Budget Committee of the Duma, in the presence of the new Minister. It was further stated that a reorganization of the central department was desirable, based on the principle of closer coöperation with the organs of local government, together with the decentralizing reform of the educational districts in favor of local associations of school boards. Count Ignatiev replied that a special committee was appointed by him to deal with the subject, its primary purpose being to reduce the areas of the educational districts. In his own opinion, a system having the provinces as the unit was certainly the best, but, owing chiefly to financial considerations, was at present impracticable. The step most likely to be taken would be the organizing of certain provinces, for instance that of Moscow, into separate administrative educational units, while others would have to be merged into groups of two or three. Pending the final adoption of the intended reform, the Minister decided to summon a conference of the curators of educational

districts in order to give them direct instructions in the matter of school administration. He expected by this means to ensure proper coördination between the policy of the central department and the activities of local authorities. Such a conference was unheard of in the annals of the department, all the more that the curators of the districts were required at this conference to listen to and acquiesce in statements and measures diametrically opposed to their most firmly rooted opinions.

This conference of curators took place at Petrograd from February 20 to 27, 1915, under the chairmanship of Count Ignatiev. The inaugural address itself expressed unmistakable condemnation of the traditions of the Department, and left no room for doubt or hesitation.

The Minister said:

> The formal attitude toward burning questions and the entire absence of the necessary relations with local elements and personalities which have hitherto prevailed, have gradually created a breach between the school and the community. We must serve the needs of the population. Educational matters must be viewed solely in the light of the claims of life. Workers and leaders in the sphere of education must understand thoroughly the mentality of the public, must consider its needs with understanding and sympathy, and must devise ways and means for their satisfaction. The cause of national education demands greater sympathy and cordiality.

The Minister further pointed out the importance of private and public initiative in the sphere of education, and the necessity for paying careful attention to the wishes of the pupils' parents. "Finally," he said, "the teacher must be placed in such a position as to be able to derive a moral satisfaction from his work."

Among the various problems discussed at the conference, those concerning primary education were dealt with first. The ordinances of M. Kasso concerning the appointment of teachers to primary schools and public libraries were declared to require revision. As regards permitting direct relations between zemstvo boards and teachers on questions of education, the conference, though approving the principle, expressed a fear that the zemstvo might overburden the teachers with a multitude of requirements. Further, the necessity was recognized of creating as soon as possible a sufficiently large body

of primary school-teachers. In this connection it was deemed expedient to increase the number of teachers' colleges, pedagogical courses, and training schools. In order to coördinate the courses of study of the upper primary schools with those of the secondary schools for boys, the conference advocated the introduction in the former of optional courses in foreign languages. Finally, in respect of the question of the language to be used in schools for non-Russian children, it came to the conclusion that instruction in the mother tongue helped the pupils in the further study of the official language. Such teaching, however, was possible and desirable only at the very beginning of the course. In the field of secondary education, most of the problems set before the conference were of a technical nature. Here, too, the curators of educational districts were obliged to abandon their former views. Thus, acting on the opinion of the Minister, that closer collaboration between school and family was highly desirable, the conference expressed the view that a simple majority should be sufficient to decide a question in parents' committees. It was agreed that class masters should cease to be regarded as mere departmental officials, but should be reckoned as active leaders of the young: "for it is the duty of this body to raise the standard of care exercised by the school for the intellectual and moral improvement of the pupils."

It was resolved to reform radically the out-of-school supervision by making it a serious educational instrument, instead of a purely external police-like observation. To this end, the parents of the pupils were first and foremost to be asked to coöperate. The conference was, moreover, very favorably disposed toward private schools, which hitherto had been merely tolerated by the district curators.

The most lively period of the conference was the discussion of a project proposed by eighty-three members of the Duma concerning a new statute for the secondary schools, which did not find favor with the Council of Ministers. It in no way detracted from the State character of the school administration, nor did it in any way attempt to criticize its existing machinery. The general scheme of reform consisted in establishing curators' councils, provincial conferences, and parents' committees. The curators' councils were to elect the headmasters, whose appointment was to be confirmed by the Minister. The provincial conferences, most of the members of which were to be

representatives of local government bodies and local authorities, were to exercise jurisdiction over local matters; but their decisions would come into force only after receiving the sanction of the district curator. Finally, the parents' committees were to exercise approximately the same functions as before. This scheme met with severe criticism at the conference from the curators, Messrs. Derevitsky, Shcherbakov, and Tikhomirov. M. Derevitsky said: "The scheme for the new statutes tends to emphasize the lack of collaboration between the public and the State. . . . Its originators wish to place the opinions and wishes of the public before everything else." M. Derevitsky's criticisms provoked a sharp reply from the Minister. Count Ignatiev remarked that he had not noticed in the scheme the tendencies that M. Derevitsky had discovered there. He added that, in general, "the interests of the public and of the State must not be made to clash."

The conference ended with a discussion of various current problems. It was held desirable to end the school year 1914-1915 as early as April 15, and to promote pupils to higher classes on the strength of marks obtained during the year. Those whose work was unsatisfactory were to be specially examined in August.

The conference of curators naturally centered round problems relating chiefly to school administration. The only matter outside this sphere was the Duma scheme for the organization of secondary schools. The actual working out of this scheme, however, fell not to the conference but to one of the special commissions appointed by the Minister for the purpose of examining proposals concerning primary and secondary education.

The Department, imbued as it was with a new vigor, considered itself bound, "in spite of the difficulties of the present day," to undertake with the greatest energy the elaboration of schemes of radical reform not only in the sphere of internal school organization but also in the matter of school programs and methods of instruction. The Ministry adopted in this respect the principle of meeting the demands of the times. It also determined to establish an unbroken connection between the primary and secondary schools and the universities.

In the sphere of primary education, the Ministry intended in the near future to submit to the legislature a series of bills. First among these were to be the bills dealing with universal primary education

and the construction of schools. Taking into consideration the sparseness of the population in many areas of Russia and the devastating results of the War, the Ministry intended to include in these bills provisions for the grant of subsidies, both continuous and extraordinary, for the purpose of establishing dormitories and homes for the use of the students. The Ministry, likewise, regarded as a problem requiring immediate solution the question of the revision of the curricula of the primary two-class and one-class schools. Though not wishing to make the primary school a purely vocational school, the Ministry still considered it highly important to render the instruction in primary schools applicable to life, and not merely dry and abstract. To this end, the Ministry intended to brighten the instruction in primary schools by bringing it into closer relation with the conditions of village and agricultural life.

The statutes and regulations under which the primary school continued to be administered after the failure of the Duma bill were condemned by the Ministry as obsolete. It decided in this connection to introduce a new statute, which would greatly benefit primary education and facilitate its introduction in any districts where this was possible.

The haste with which the Ministry undertook the preparation of various bills having to do with primary education was explained in its memorandum attached to the estimates for 1916. In the opinion of the Ministry no effort should be spared to render possible a more rapid development of primary education after the War. It therefore considered it expedient to prepare without delay all the measures necessary for such a development. For the same reason, it added, no decrease could be contemplated in the number of the newly opened training colleges for teachers, although it had been forced by financial considerations to reduce, in comparison with previous years, the rate at which such new colleges were founded. On the contrary, it considered it its duty to make ever greater efforts for the training of primary school-teachers, in view of the future vigorous educational campaign.

In 1916, the total number of teachers' training colleges and schools was 168. Of these 21 had been opened in 1914 and 20 in 1915. As in the past, however, their number was insufficient to provide teachers for the new schools and to fill the vacancies which arose in those previously existing.

In 1916, the Ministry determined to open 25 new teachers' colleges. It also started the preparation of a scheme for founding 93 teachers' colleges as a memorial of the tercentenary of the Romanov dynasty and for opening special colleges for women teachers, of which there had hitherto been none. At the same time it asked for a grant of 50,000 rubles for the organization in the near future of 10 or 12 permanent training schools with courses of study of from two to three years, for the training of primary school-teachers in those districts where the need for them was most acutely felt.

For the purpose of completing and improving the educational standard of the existing teaching staff, the Ministry, following the example of the zemstvos, which had borne such good results, determined to organize on its own initiative short-term summer courses of a general, pedagogical, or special nature. These courses were to take place in regular succession at equal intervals of time in every district and town.

The number of teachers' training colleges had increased in 1916 to 43. Of these, 6 had been opened in 1914 and 5 in 1915. The Ministry regarded it as absolutely necessary to open 5 more colleges in 1916. At the same time it had drafted and laid before the legislature a bill authorizing the establishment of training colleges for women on the same basis as for men. The Ministry, however, did not confine itself to opening or proposing to open new teachers' colleges and schools, and permanent and short-term training courses. It also set to work on the preparation of new programs for these, as well as the revision of programs for the eighth class of the gymnasia for girls.

The Ministry fully realized the value of frequent intercourse on educational and other school matters between teachers. To further such intercourse it decided to frame, in place of the obsolete statutes of 1875, new rules concerning the establishment of short-term courses and conferences.

Nor did it overlook the higher primary schools. These were all the more important, now that the principle of the unity of the school system was to be adopted in practice, since they were to form the basis of the preparatory stage in every branch of the system. The department decided to put an end to the haphazard method of opening such schools then prevalent, and for the first time in its career set to work to draft a scheme for the systematic development of such schools. With this end in view, it sent inquiry forms to the district

curators, inviting them to get into touch with the provincial governors, marshals of nobility, and local government bodies, in order to discuss the question of convening district and provincial conferences. The conferences were to choose localities where it was desirable to open upper primary schools, and discuss any other question that might arise in this connection and among others that of establishing dormitories for pupils and lodgings for the teachers. Concurrently with the above, the Ministry undertook the preparation of a new curriculum and set of rules for the upper primary schools.

Finally, also for the first time in its history, the Ministry under Count Ignatiev's direction seriously considered the problem of continuation schools for adults. It quite rightly realized, that the four-year course of the Russian primary school, with no preparatory instruction, was followed in the majority of cases by a period during which the knowledge acquired was gradually forgotten. The schools therefore often failed of their purpose, and the considerable expenditure incurred by the State and by local bodies was wasted. Under these conditions, continuation schools, in the opinion of the Ministry, assumed great importance.

Such institutions were intended to widen and strengthen the knowledge of those who had not received or had not completed their primary education and were already too old for it. Bearing in mind the peculiar problems with which continuation schools had to deal, the Ministry realized that it could not by itself cope with the matter. The bulk of the work must fall on the organs of local government, with the coöperation of representatives of the Ministry and with the help of subsidies from the Treasury. In view of this, the Ministry assured the zemstvo and municipal organizations that they would in future have to bear only a small fraction of the total expenditure on continuation schools, the bulk of it being covered by government subsidies. In spite of grave financial difficulties, the Ministry even in 1916 asked for and obtained a grant of 500,000 rubles for helping local organizations in the matter of continuation schools.

In the field of secondary education, the Ministry expressed the intention of undertaking a radical reform of the secondary schools. With this object in view, it summoned a special conference in April 1915, consisting of members of the legislature, university professors, headmasters and teachers of the secondary schools. Meanwhile, the Ministry determined to pass, without waiting for the completion of

the scheme of the reform, a series of measures for the purpose of creating a healthier and more elevated atmosphere in the secondary schools.

The ordinances of Count Ignatiev are worthy of note, if only for the fact that they were his first practical measures in the management of the secondary schools and had as their definite purpose the improvement of the system of moral education and the increase of the authority and jurisdiction of the school boards. The need for certain changes in these matters had doubtless previously been felt by the Ministry. In the short interval between the death of M. Kasso and the appointment of Count Ignatiev, the temporary head of the Ministry, Baron Taube, appointed a special committee, consisting of representatives of the Ministry, university professors, and headmasters. This committee was to work out a scheme for the "reorganization of the moral and instructional functions of the secondary schools."

According to the report of the chairman of the committee, the vice-president of the Department of Education, M. Bertoldy, all the blame for the anomalies prevailing in the secondary schools rested on the administrative and teaching staffs of the schools. The report stated "that both the headmaster and the teachers neglect to fulfil the duties belonging to the school boards. The teachers and class masters have, with a few exceptions, no idea of the conditions in which their pupils live and work. Their estimates of the progress made by their pupils are constantly at variance with the pupils' actual knowledge as revealed at examination time." The description of the state of the education in the secondary schools given by the report was certainly correct. The remedy proposed for this painful state of things was however absolutely hopeless. The reorganization of moral education in the secondary schools had been, for many years, in the hands, not of the school boards, but almost entirely of the Minister himself and of the district curators. The only possible and right way of becoming acquainted with the conditions in which the pupils lived and worked was through the close collaboration of school and family. This way, however, was barred by the departmental measures against the parents' associations. Count Ignatiev grappled with this problem in an entirely different way. In his opinion, the main fault lay in the excessive centralization of school administration. In his regulations of July 25, 1915, he pointed out that "cen-

tralization of administration does not strengthen the authority of headmasters and teachers in the eyes of the public, whereas this is very much to be desired in the interest of education." The Ministry, therefore, considered it inexpedient to maintain this centralization in future.

> While widening the sphere of influence of local institutions and giving them the freedom that renders them independent . . . the Ministry reserves for itself the task of general supervision. It is firmly convinced that the persons who have been called to direct the schools and have received the necessary wide authority will not exercise it merely to secure the correct application of existing rules and regulations. They must also show initiative . . . in order to further the training generally and to promote the development on healthy lines of the mental, spiritual, and physical welfare of the children entrusted to their care.

This ordinance, however, contained no definite suggestions and the result therefore was that it was limited to a mere statement of principle.

The declaration of the widened sphere of authority of the school boards was first made by the Minister in his ordinance of September 25, 1915. In this ordinance he stated that he had full confidence in the school boards, and gave them a wide scope in the matter of the improvement of school life. He was sure that "their educational work would be free from dry formalism and imbued with benevolence and a genuine desire to meet the spiritual needs of the younger generation." The school boards were to reorganize the moral side of education. They were to pay special attention to methods of moral persuasion of the pupils, as opposed to those of purely external discipline. In the sphere of instruction, the Ministry intended that the school boards should remove certain difficulties in the curricula. These difficulties "occasioned by the excessive number of subjects included in the program" were to be overcome by sifting out from the mass of available material that which was essential and important. The formal method of estimating the pupils' progress should be superseded by an improved method of supervision. The results obtained by this method must represent the sum total of the impressions received from the careful and complete study of the individuality and the peculiarities of each pupil.

Both family and educational circles expressed definite approval of

the ordinance of September 25. The basic principles of this ordinance had been drawn up almost entirely by teachers and writers on education.

Practical application, however, of the new instructions was greatly hampered by the fact that they had not been formally coördinated with the statutes of the secondary schools then in existence nor had these statutes been altered accordingly. The Ministry recognized the defects of its first ordinances and on January 19, 1916, Count Ignatiev issued a new ordinance on the organization of the secondary schools. The powers of the school boards were now coördinated with their existing official powers and the powers of the directing organs of school administration. "While regarding the school boards with the confidence which is their due," read the ordinance,

> and while affording them wide scope in the matter of improving school life, the Ministry nevertheless considers itself bound to point out that the right of directing the work of improvement belongs first and foremost to the curators of educational districts. . . . Therefore all projects and schemes of the school boards must before their execution be laid before the curators. It is the duty of the latter to discuss fully the measures suggested and to see that they are unified and coördinated.

Dealing with the problems of teaching, the ordinance of January 19 repeated and to a certain extent developed the views previously expressed by the Department.

The new ordinance manifested genuine benevolence and sympathy toward pupils and teachers alike. Its general views on the problems and object of secondary education were such as to evoke nothing but the warmest approval. This new pronouncement of the Ministry, however, went to an opposite extreme, which was out of harmony with the principle of the independence of the school boards, in requiring all the measures adopted by the latter to be sanctioned by the curators. Thus the middle course had not yet been found by Count Ignatiev in any of his earlier ordinances touching secondary education. The uncertainty and hesitation manifested in these decrees gave rise, at one time, among those who had the cause of education at heart, even to a feeling of disappointment in the new Minister. An educational review enjoying a wide circulation wrote: "We must admit that the Minister's reputation rests mainly on his good intentions and promises, which are indeed abundant." This feeling of

disappointment was, however, of short duration. The second conference of curators, called by Count Ignatiev soon after the ordinance of January 19, was to serve once more as proof that the Minister remained absolutely faithful to the program he had previously outlined. At the above-mentioned conference he stated, first of all, that he did not admit any possible disobedience to his orders by local authorities. Various practical questions, such as those of the final examination, the part played by representatives of the Ministry at examinations in private schools not enjoying full rights, parents' committees, administration of primary schools, were all solved in accordance with the Minister's directions. The series of ministerial decrees touching secondary education that followed left no room for doubt that the adopted plan of educational reform was being put into practice in its entirety.

One of the first practical measures adopted by the new Minister was the promulgation of rules governing parents' committees. These put an end to the conditions under which election to such committees attached to the secondary schools had been extremely difficult. By the ordinance of September 1915, one-third the total number of parents in a given school were sufficient to constitute a quorum. Not content with this, the Minister in July 1916 issued new regulations regarding parents' organizations, by which the proportion necessary to constitute a quorum was lowered to one-fifth. These regulations also, for the first time, established a time limit of six weeks within which the district authorities were to ratify or to quash the elections. This made it impossible for the decisions of the district authorities to be received only toward the end of the school year, as had often happened in the past. The new regulations caused a considerable stir in public circles. Associations of parents, hitherto almost the exception in secondary schools, now became the general rule. Equally drastic was Count Ignatiev's solution of the problem of promotion and final examinations. In the ordinance of February 11, 1916, methods alternative to rigid final examination, such as were usually employed in the private schools even where examinations were compulsory, were recommended for the estimation of the pupils' progress. These were oral tests, monthly examinations on certain portions of the school course, written papers, as well as other methods which in the opinion of the school boards indicated that the pupils had really learned the prescribed subject, as also that the instruction

in any particular subject was carried out in accordance with approved principles. Quite as drastic were the measures adopted by the Minister with regard to private schools. Hitherto merely tolerated, they were now considered deserving of both moral and material support. The teaching staffs of the private schools, together with their founders, were invited to share in directing the educational work of the school. At the same time, by a series of new regulations, district inspectors were required to carry on their supervision without official "inspection" in any form.

In one particular case the Minister also succeeded in freeing the Ministry from its traditional dependence on other State departments —a condition of affairs that was highly detrimental to the cause of education as a whole. Before the opening of the 1916-1917 school year, the Premier, who was at the same time Foreign Secretary, M. Shturmer, on his own authority and without consulting Count Ignatiev, issued an order requiring all schools in Petrograd to begin work a month later than usual. Count Ignatiev lodged a protest before the Council of Ministers, which agreed that effect should not be given to M. Shturmer's order. This seemingly insignificant victory of the Ministry of Education assumed great importance in the light of the conditions existing in Russia. It definitely showed that the new Minister had no intention of going back on his repeatedly expressed opinions. Also, that educational matters had an integral importance and could not be sacrificed to any extraneous interests. The independent and steadfast attitude adopted by the Minister in safeguarding the interests entrusted to him served to enhance the prestige and importance not only of the department, but also of the rank and file of educational workers.

The practical measures and decisions of Count Ignatiev, therefore, served not merely to improve certain features in the organization of the secondary schools, but also marked successive stages in the application of his scheme of reform of secondary education.

By the beginning of the school year 1916-1917, the committee appointed by the Minister had completed the preparation of a program of teaching for the secondary schools which was submitted for discussion to a number of special conferences of teachers. It differed markedly from all previous official schemes by its daring and pronounced modernism. In the first place, the scheme limited the secondary school course to seven years, dividing it into two parts: the

junior division of three years, and the senior of four. The junior division of the course formed a self-contained whole. Its standard corresponded to that of the upper primary schools. Thus the direct connection between primary and secondary education was emphasized. Its curriculum differed from that of the three lower classes of the gymnasia in that (i) Latin and modern languages were excluded, (ii) the hours of study were limited to twenty-five per week in the first and second years, and twenty-seven in the third, and finally (iii) such subjects as were included under the term "general training"—athletics, drawing, singing, and practical work in natural science—had more hours allotted to them than hitherto.

The senior division of the projected course was again subdivided into three groups: (i) non-classical subjects, (ii) classical subjects, and (iii) natural science (with a mathematics sub-group). The old classical gymnasia in which both Latin and Greek were taught came under a different heading. According to the scheme, only a limited number of schools of the latter type were to be opened.

The chief characteristics of the non-classical subjects group were the absence of Latin and Greek and a greater number of hours devoted to the study of modern languages, Russian, and history. The chief characteristic of the classical group was the study of Latin and Greek. This occupied twenty-three hours per week in its four years, the necessary time being obtained by omitting natural science altogether, greatly curtailing mathematics and slightly Russian, history, physics, geography, and modern languages. The natural science group, in turn, was conspicuous by the amount of time allotted to mathematics and natural science at the expense of modern languages, history, and Russian. The difference between the two subgroups of the natural science group was in the hours allotted to mathematics, the natural science sub-group having seventeen, and the mathematics twenty-two hours per week. The natural science sub-group, instead of the five extra mathematics classes, had two classes in chemistry, two in logic, and two extra classes in natural history.

As regards general training in the senior division, physical training occupied a prominent place in the school schedules of all the divisions. The first two divisions, moreover, had two hours a week assigned to an entirely new subject: study of fine arts.

The new scheme of secondary education, however daring or sound

some of the premises on which it was founded may have been, could not but give rise to certain serious doubts. First and foremost of these was the question whether it was capable of practical realization. For the three groups of the senior division together with the mathematics sub-group, according to the complete scheme, sixteen classrooms were needed. This arrangement did not allow for any possible parallel classes. It was doubtful whether all or even the majority of the secondary schools could, owing to material conditions, carry into effect the proposed scheme of division. In that case, the object of the separation of the senior classes into groups, that is, specialization in accordance with a pupil's abilities, would not in practice have been attained, since the transfer of pupils from one school to another is often very inconvenient both for them and for their parents; many would prefer to remain in the same school, even though its senior classes were not divided into groups. This was one of the sacrifices imposed by the new scheme.

Another sacrifice had been made earlier, during the preparation of the scheme by the conference. It consisted in the abandonment of the "two-terms-a-year" system of teaching, which was proposed by them at an earlier date, and which had certain great advantages over the "one-term-a-year" system. The reason for the abandonment was that the system required that the number of classes, which was already very large, be doubled. Such a requirement would have made it quite impossible to carry out the scheme.

The project concerning secondary education proposed by eighty-three members of the Duma, which also pre-supposed the division, or so-called "bifurcation" of the senior classes into groups, was a far more practical one. According to this, only the two senior classes were separated into groups. At the same time, the compulsory curriculum of fundamental subjects remained the same in all the classes.

Count Ignatiev's scheme was open to criticism from a purely educational point of view, in respect, for instance, of the somewhat artificial distribution of hours among various subjects, the curtailment of the mathematics course in the classical and humanitarian sciences groups, the abolition of modern languages in the lower and middle classes, etc.

It cannot be denied, however, that the scheme presented many great improvements upon the programs previously in existence. The seven-year course; the two divisions of the secondary schools, which

allowed each to be opened separately; the introduction of an unbroken connection between the primary and secondary schools; the diminished strain on the pupil caused by the daily school work; the marked emphasis laid on the "general training" education; the introduction of practical work in certain branches—all these features tended to make the further development of the scheme a matter of great interest to educational circles.

In November 1916, the work of the conference for the reform of secondary schools was finished. Certain corrections and additions had been made in the original draft of the scheme. These were as yet unpublished, when the Department itself underwent a radical change, which jeopardized the future of the scheme itself.

At a time when the reform of boys' secondary schools was yet in the embryo stage, girls' schools enjoyed better conditions. On July 3, 1916 two laws were passed, one respecting a five-year increment to the salaries of the staff of girls' gymnasia, and the other concerning certain changes in their organization. This modest expression, however, covered a radical reform. In the first place, the law provided that the qualifications of the staff in girls' schools should be the same as that in boys' schools. The rights of the pupils were also altered. They were to receive the degree of "home teachers" only if the course had been reorganized into one of two or three years' duration, including a special course in pedagogics. At the same time the law allowed the conversion of the course of the eighth year into either a special or a general course. In the latter case, those who had completed the course were allowed to enter colleges for women without an additional examination based on the syllabus of the boys' gymnasia.

It is evident that the laws respecting girls' schools were promulgated in the full assurance that the reform of secondary schools for boys would shortly be carried out. This, however, did not take place. As a result it was found somewhat difficult to put the new laws into practice. But however this may be, the laws of July 3, 1916, were a considerable step in the right direction, and opened a new and wide future to the girls' gymnasia. Moreover, apart from the practical value of the individual measures adopted by the new Minister, his activity had a moral influence all its own. It instilled a new spirit into the schools, enhanced the authority of the teachers in the opinion of the public, as also, which was equally important, in their own. It

created a healthier atmosphere in the offices of the department, and converted the rank and file of the teachers and ordinary citizen-parents from "unauthorized persons" into frequent visitors at the centers of school administration. This aspect of the matter alone was sufficient to arouse the energy and enthusiasm of persons interested in national education.

The ordinance of January 19, 1916 had directed the district curators to summon periodical conferences of secondary school headmasters. Soon after the ordinance, such conferences were summoned in the educational districts of Kiev, Kharkov, Kazan, Petrograd, and Warsaw. Their membership was much wider than that prescribed in the ordinance. They included not only the headmasters but also representatives of the parents' committees, as well as many of the rank and file of the teaching staff. Although at these conferences there were many representatives of the school administration, headmasters of government schools, and presidents of the school boards of the girls' gymnasia, there was no one who favored Kasso's régime: rigid examinations, superficial inspection, or methods of repression. At the Kharkov conferences, the curator himself, M. Korolkov, actively encouraged coöperation among teachers.

The resolution adopted at the conferences touched upon many serious problems of school life. The members were keenly interested in a number of questions, for instance that of widening the sphere of authority of the school boards, of determining the legal status of teachers, of strengthening and enlarging parents' committees, of class and home education, of examinations at the end of the term, of certificates of graduation, etc. All were unanimous in condemning the old system of education, whose principal business, according to the conferences, was to instil as many abstract facts as possible into the pupil, without doing anything to ensure his proper general training. It did not trust his intelligence, but set a barrier between him and his teacher. All were agreed that the main purpose of a properly organized system of teaching should be the all-round development of the individual. The acquisition of knowledge should be a creative pleasure. The purpose of knowledge lies in the process of acquiring it, and not merely in its superficial results. Among the suggestions adopted by the conferences, that directed against the old system of out-of-school supervision is worthy of notice. It recommended the organization "locally of special societies for the care of pupils out

of school." They were to include representatives of parents, of municipal organizations, and of the community at large.

Besides these general conferences in educational districts, for the first time in history conferences of teachers of geography, of mathematics, of modern languages, and of Russian also took place. The last named conference attracted most attention. It was held from December 27, 1916 to January 4, 1917, but was prepared and authorized while Count Ignatiev was still in office. The Minister was very favorably disposed toward this conference, and was prepared to give careful consideration to the criticisms made by the teachers on his newly published curriculum for secondary schools. The attendance comprised 1,100 men and 270 women teachers, some of them belonging to very distant parts of the country. The discussion covered general problems connected with teaching, and special questions respecting the teaching of Russian language and literature. That which related to the official curricula and the question of simplifying Russian spelling aroused most interest.

It was necessary, in the opinion of the conference, to establish a close connection between the primary and the secondary schools, and so make it easier for the children to enter the former. The assimilation of the curricula for boys' and girls' schools, the lengthening of the first division of the secondary-school course to four years and of the whole course to eight, were likewise thought expedient. The curricula, it was recognized, were set out in too much detail; only the essential minimum should be given. On the question of spelling, an overwhelming majority voted in favor of simplification. Accordingly, it was agreed to send a petition to the Academy of Sciences, asking it to complete its work on the subject as quickly as possible.

The Ministry also summoned a conference of officers in charge of the supervision of the primary schools, which was held from December 15 to 25, 1916. The resolutions of the latter were, generally, in accordance with the principles that had for long been firmly upheld in zemstvo and educational circles. These principles had now been adopted by the central department.

The parents' organizations were not left out of this universal activity. Conferences of representatives of the parents' committees were organized in many towns for the purpose of discussing a series of measures designed to ensure the closest possible connection between school and family, and the adequate organization of out-of-

school supervision. For instance, the parents' committees of the town of Ryazan decided to coöperate with the local pedagogical society in organizing a "Youths' Association." The association building was to be equipped with a library, physical-training department, garden, stage, model workshops, etc. It was to provide for pupils of both sexes healthy recreation, which would broaden their outlook and improve their physical well-being. This plan conceived in Ryazan was actually carried into practice, and was adopted in certain other towns.

As a result of the change in the Ministry's policy, new teachers' organizations came into being. Thus, in the autumn of 1916, there was founded in Kiev a Regional Pedagogical Society. The charter of the Moscow Pedagogical Society was likewise ratified. The object of the latter was "the discussion of problems of education and the spreading among the public of scientific views on education and teaching."

Finally there appeared in certain places, for instance at Ryazan, pupils' social and other organizations—which had hitherto been impossible. These organizations received both moral and financial support from the Ministry.

During Count Ignatiev's term of office, the question of non-Russian schools was raised at the same time as that of Russian schools. When he was appointed Minister, hopes began to be entertained that the anomalous position of the non-Russian schools would at last be altered. In January 1915, a delegation from the Ukraine interviewed the Minister, and presented a memorandum on the state of the primary schools in that part of Russia. The delegation was of opinion that instruction, at any rate in the lower classes, should be given in the Ukrainian tongue in the primary schools of those provinces where the population was Ukrainian. Russian should be considered the principal subject. Textbooks, etc., both in language and contents should be adapted to local needs. The study of the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian literature and geography should be introduced in the teachers' colleges of the Ukraine. In universities, a chair of Ukrainian study should be established. Private schools in which the Ukrainian language was taught should be allowed freely to carry on their work, provided that Russian occupied a prominent place in their programs of study. The Minister listened with great attention

to these representations and, in any case, did not reject the petition of the delegation.

The work of reform undertaken by the rejuvenated Ministry had just reached its maximum intensity when the fears that had been expressed by M. Rusanov on March 14, 1916 in the debate of the Duma on the estimates of the Ministry of Education were found to be justified. Count Ignatiev was not destined to carry out his plans. On December 27 he was superseded as Minister by M. Kulchitsky, formerly curator of the educational district of Petrograd.

It is difficult to describe the effect that Count Ignatiev's retirement had on the widest circles of Russian society. The responsible post of Minister had been vacated by a man who had earned the firm and genuine sympathy of the nation. This sympathy was felt both by the public at large and by members of the legislature, by zemstvo and town workers, by countless teachers and parents, and last but not least, by the members of his Department. It is no exaggeration to say that Count Ignatiev's retirement was in the nature of a challenge to public opinion—a kind of *coup d'état* and the portent of some inexorable cataclysm in the future.

Count Ignatiev was not a pedagogue and was not familiar with the minute details of educational problems. He was therefore free from the prejudices and habits of a narrow professionalism. In the space of two years he succeeded in mastering all the important educational problems, and in making arrangements for their practical solution. Much in his schemes was left unfinished. Much that was completed suffered from inevitable defects. More, however, could not be expected from a man who throughout these years had to work in the atmosphere of depression engendered by the War, at variance with his fellow Ministers, hampered by the firmly established routine of the government offices. In any case, Count Ignatiev succeeded in passing a series of measures of extreme importance, and in preparing a series of others of even greater value. His program of reform was always businesslike, and inspired by no interest other than the advancement of education. The mere fact that Count Ignatiev had succeeded in overcoming the formalism of officialdom in the Department under his control, and in instilling enthusiasm for energetic work into a whole army of his subordinates, from the highest officials to the rank and file of school workers, was in itself the successful accomplishment of a whole program of reform. An excellent proof that

this program had been duly carried out is offered by the telegram which the All-Russian Conference of Teachers of Russian, deeply affected by the news of M. Kulchitsky's appointment, sent to Count Ignatiev. The telegram ended with the words: "You may be sure that the teachers of Russia, filled with enthusiasm by your work, will endeavor to carry out your noble plans." Among all the things said and written in connection with Count Ignatiev's retirement, his own words addressed as a farewell to the officials of his Ministry are worthy of note: "There is no room in statesmanship for a cleavage between the Government and the nation. We are all members of one social body, of a State or of a town. This motto I brought to the Ministry of Education; it has been my guiding principle throughout my work here." Such were the words with which the retiring Minister described his policy. Count Ignatiev had opened a new era in the history of Russian education. There were reasons to fear that with his departure this era would also pass away.

CHAPTER V

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION IN 1917 UP TO THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

M. Kulchitsky, formerly a professor of histology and embryology, had for a year and a half occupied the post of curator of the Petrograd educational district. In January 1916, during Count Ignatiev's term of office, he was dismissed. He had now, on his appointment as Minister, to define his attitude toward the policy of his predecessor.

In answer to the first question concerning his program M. Kulchitsky declared that "he had been totally misrepresented" and that he was in no way an enemy of the projected reforms. He "intended to reserve the right of effecting such corrections as he might deem necessary. In general it was his wish so to arrange matters as not to irritate the Duma, but, on the contrary, to enlist its support." The words of the new Minister, however, did not allay the fears entertained by the public as to the fate of the invaluable heritage entrusted to him. Symptoms of a new tendency were already apparent. The conference of heads of teachers' colleges, which had been summoned by Count Ignatiev, but which was actually held under his successor, but little resembled the well-attended and enthusiastic conferences of the preceding era. All speeches and proposals were of an extremely moderate character. All the improvements proposed in the organization of teachers' colleges were based on existing conditions, and had no connection with the radical reform of these institutions which had already been prepared by the Duma in collaboration with the Ministry. M. Kulchitsky himself, if we are to trust the accuracy of the *Russkya Vedomosti* correspondent's report of his interview with the Minister, stated that "without desiring to reject Count Ignatiev's schemes, he, nevertheless, had no intention of supporting them. If the Duma should not agree with him, the matter would be referred to the State Council, and, finally, to the Emperor, to whom all legislation is submitted for ratification."

The fate of Count Ignatiev's proposals was, accordingly, rendered uncertain from the outset. Their realization and particularly the

solution of the problem of the secondary-school reform were again postponed to some indefinite date. There remained, it is true, the hope that the results of the work accomplished by Count Ignatiev during his tenure of office would not be entirely obliterated; that the new spirit with which he had imbued the school and its workers would not allow education to relapse into its old methods. Still there was ground for anticipating unnecessary friction and attempts at reaction in the near future. The Revolution, however, which broke out at the end of February, 1917, solved all these problems in its own way.

There is no need for us to follow all the changes that took place in school life up to the October *coup d'état*. There was no room for organized constructive work. Problems arose and were solved by the force of events. M. Manuilov, who became a member of the Provisional Government as Minister of Education, in practice did not possess full authority. He had formerly been Rector of the University of Moscow and had been dismissed from office by M. Kasso in 1911. His successors in July 1917, Messrs. Oldenburg and Salazkin, also had no authority, nor, needless to say, had any of the less important members of the educational administration. The individual efforts that were made to guide school policy aright and to place it on a sound footing are, however, worthy of notice. They not only present features of historical interest but are also valuable as practical experience for the future.

During the first few months of the Revolution, the new Government did not officially repeal the old laws or even the ordinances defining the status of the primary schools. Of the few decrees concerning primary education issued by the Provisional Government, the only one worthy of note was that of March, 1917, by which instruction in the Ukrainian language was authorized in the primary schools of that region. Judging from certain ordinances of the Ministry, there was even reason to think that it was in no hurry to abolish the old order. According to M. Manuilov's ordinance, the termination of the school year in the primary schools was to be fixed by the inspector of primary schools, with the approval of the school boards and zemstvo boards. In practice, matters turned out quite differently. The official laws and regulations ceased to be enforced, and the teachers' unions and even individual teachers were afforded ample scope for the display of initiative.

The All-Russian Teachers' Union, which came into existence as early as 1905 and was disbanded in 1908, was again revived in the form of regional congresses of delegates. Such congresses were held in Petrograd, Moscow, and Kiev at the beginning of 1917. It was at the regional congresses held in Petrograd and Moscow and also at a convention of the Petrograd teachers (in March 1917) that M. Manuilov first defined publicly the outlines of his program. He first of all stated that his object was the democratization of the school. He took the following principle as the basis for his reform. All the grades of education were to be interconnected. Schools were to be open to all. The school administration was to be organized on the elective basis. The educational staff was to have wide authority in administrative matters. The system of continuation schools was to be developed. The church parish schools were to be placed under the control of the Ministry. Finally, the material condition of the teachers was to be improved as much as possible. If officially, the Minister added, little had been done to enforce the reform of education, great changes had been accomplished in fact. The old ordinances continued in force only on paper; it remained for the Government to sanction their repeal which had already taken place *de facto*.

In the Minister's opinion, it was necessary to effect the reform without delay, so that the autumn term might start under new conditions. The actual preparation of projects was entrusted to the State Committee on National Education which had been established at the Ministry. This committee was composed of representatives of the teaching staffs of the primary schools, teachers' organizations, parents' committees, and also experts in the theory and practice of education. The Ministry thus intended to abolish entirely the old system of education. The new system was to be based on the principle of securing the widest coöperation of the public itself and of enlisting in the matter of school administration the assistance of various pedagogical and social institutions. The teachers' congresses declared themselves, on the whole, in favor of M. Manuilov's schemes of reform, but thought that they stood in need of greater elaboration of detail. The Moscow Regional Congress sent a delegation to the Minister to represent to him that Russia's schools should be radically reorganized on principles of democracy, liberty, and decentralization. For this purpose the congress was of opinion that schools belonging to every type and department should be united under the

control of the Ministry, and that the machinery of the latter should be reorganized on a democratic basis. They advocated that elective collegiate bodies, consisting of representatives of teachers' associations and of public bodies, should be substituted for the bureaucratic boards of the educational districts, as also similar bodies for the directors and inspectors of the primary schools. School boards should have the right to elect the head of every school and all ministerial schemes should be submitted to the preliminary examinaton of teachers' associations and public bodies. Of the principles on which, in the opinion of the congress, education itself should be based, the following are worthy of note: the introduction of compulsory primary education, the abolition of fees in all schools, and the guarantee of education for all. Schemes for primary education were being elaborated by the Ministry of Education in the spirit that inspired the above conclusions—a spirit which practically abolished the exclusive right of initiative of the Ministry in educational matters.

However, even before the adoption of the projected reforms, the responsible leaders of the Department of Education were forced, in practice, to resign, if not the whole, at any rate most of their authority in favor of various collegiate bodies. In the central department, special importance was acquired by the State Committee, which was supported by the Executive of the Soviet of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies. The State Committee determined to carry out at once the complete reorganization of the whole system of schools. It was absorbed in the preparation of this reform, hoping to carry it through rapidly, and in the drafting of far-reaching and complicated bills. Consequently, it neither saw to the current needs of primary education, nor permitted the Ministry to do so. The result was that with every succeeding month the primary schools were left more and more to themselves. The devoted work of individual educational workers still supported them to a certain extent. But their position was becoming increasingly uncertain and unstable.

The condition of secondary schools was very similar, though its power of resistance to destructive influences was, perhaps, greater and it therefore held out longer. The Revolution at first had no direct influence on the secondary schools, though naturally many of the somber aspects of the policy of the former Government, such as the restrictions based on religious or racial characteristics, were now of no further consequence. Both the staffs and the pupils of the schools

were, as was natural, deeply affected and excited by the *coup d'état*, but this was merely the inevitable effect of changes experienced by the whole community. During the first few months of the Revolution there were no special school troubles or disturbances. As the educational press said with much truth, "The school took part in the Revolution, but there was no revolution in the school itself." There was, in this respect, a great difference between what happened in 1917 and what had happened in the secondary schools in October to December 1905. At that time, normal school work ceased altogether. Both the relations between the pupils and the school authorities, and those between the authorities and individual teachers became strained almost to the breaking point. Anarchy reigned in the schools. Pupils rioted, created obstruction, and sometimes even sacked the school buildings. In 1917, nothing of the sort took place. The moral authority of the teacher over the pupils, created during the War and supported by the policy of Count Ignatiev, still persisted. The teachers themselves showed greater readiness to solve the pupils' doubts and problems. It is true that in a few particular cases there were demonstrations by the pupils against unpopular teachers, but these cases were definitely exceptional and in no way typical of the secondary schools as a whole. The associations of parents, moreover, revived by the efforts of Count Ignatiev, did much to preserve normal conditions. At the outbreak of the Revolution these organizations existed in practically every secondary school. Their relations with the teaching staff were, in general, entirely peaceful and often cordial. Neither before the Revolution nor after it was there any sign of political excitement among the pupils. The pupils of the senior classes before the Revolution echoed the sentiments voiced by the public, which was hostile to the Government. They freely criticized the latter, but that was all. Though many of them took an active part in street demonstrations during the first few days of the Revolution, this did not affect the political feelings of the whole. The seniors showed no eagerness, as in 1905, to enroll themselves as members of some political party. The attempt to create a "revolutionary organization of secondary school pupils" with a definite political purpose met with no success. Such an organization was no doubt created. It arranged several meetings and issued a few proclamations calling the secondary-school pupils out on strike. But it had no influence whatever, and very soon sank entirely into the background. When

the pupils returned to school, after a short interruption caused by the Revolution, the usual school work was resumed. The intensity of work was certainly undiminished after the Revolution.

As events developed, their influence on the mentality of the pupils became more and more marked. Those of the pupils who had contrived to join the militia often witnessed in their quarters scenes entirely unsuitable to their years. It was not till some time later that this was realized and the participation of schoolboys in the operations of the militia forbidden. Street demonstrations, the placarding of the various slogans, and occasional acts of violence began to influence the minds of the school youth. Even greater was the effect of the general state of feverish excitement, frequent meetings, the numerous organizations, and the intensive propaganda of the various political parties. All these factors acting together tended to arouse in pupils an ardent desire for active "political" work. Here and there in the schools mass meetings were held. At these meetings resolutions were passed commenting on the educational arrangements and advocating the dismissal of unpopular teachers. New associations, uniting many secondary schools, began to arise in place of the school "revolutionary organization," which had disappeared. We have information concerning such bodies in Moscow and Petrograd. In the latter city it did not go beyond questions suitable to the age and interests of the pupils. The pupil-delegates of the secondary schools met in conference and elected a board of the Union of Secondary Schools. The board was entrusted with the preparation of schemes for societies for self-education, libraries, reading rooms, theatricals, excursions, etc. Special attention was paid by the conference to the problem of organizing farm squads. The pupils' organizations in Moscow were entirely different. The Moscow press stated, "The union of Moscow schoolboys already possesses many of the characteristics of similar unions in 1905. We have reason to fear that it may become a destructive element in the schools."

Nevertheless, the latter half of the school year 1916-1917 ended far more peacefully than had been expected. At the same time there was greater cause for apprehension concerning the state of education than at the beginning of the year. It must be noted also, that in compliance with M. Manuilov's ordinance, schools broke up somewhat earlier than usual. Secondary schools had successfully withstood the first shock, which is generally the worst. It was clear that

proper supervision and leadership must be organized before the beginning of the next school year; otherwise such leadership would be practically lost.

This problem, naturally, was bound to present itself to the Ministry. First and foremost it was necessary to replace those representatives of the old administration, who were known to be supporters of the régime that had passed away forever. This replacement was, in fact, carried out. Of the curators the first to resign was M. Tikhomirov, curator of the Petrograd educational district. His successor was the head of the Moscow college for women, M. Chapligin. During the summer the district inspectors, as well as the directors and inspectors of the primary schools, were likewise dismissed. The Department of the Empress Marie became the Department of Public Charitable Institutions, while the church parish schools were taken over by the Ministry of Education. The State Committee on National Education was actively and hurriedly engaged on the preparation of a bill concerning secondary schools. This bill, however, was not ready before the beginning of the new school year, and was not submitted for the sanction of the Provisional Government until October 1917. It presents many points of interest. The administration of secondary schools was to be completely decentralized and entrusted to the school boards. The latter were to be increased by representatives of the local government bodies (two in number), and of the parents (to the extent of one-third of the total number of teachers). Senior pupils were to be allowed to participate in special commissions of the board for the purpose of discussing certain questions of education or domestic management. The board organized on these lines was given wide authority in matters of domestic management and teaching. It was empowered to appoint a new headmaster, new teachers, and a new administrative staff. It could on a majority vote of two-thirds exclude members of the school staff from its own membership. It was to solve problems of internal school organization, subject, however, to being empowered by the authorities of the educational districts to deal with such questions as the reorganization of the school on the new lines, the introduction of new subjects into the course of study, the co-education of boys and girls, etc.

The Minister of Education submitted the scheme of the State Committee in its entirety to the criticism of the Provisional Government. The only alteration made was that district curators were given

the right to sanction or reject resolutions of the school boards concerning the appointment or removal of members of the school staff.

At a somewhat earlier date (at the beginning of September 1917) the State Committee had prepared proposals for the new secondary-school curricula. According to these, the secondary school was divided into two sections—a senior and a junior. The latter was, after a period of three years, to be gradually transformed into the upper primary school. This was to be effected by a series of gradual reforms. It was too late to carry out this project in 1917. Much may be said with regard to it. It had undoubted merits and obvious defects. But, after all, it was nothing more than a draft. Meanwhile conditions were such that the establishment, as quickly as possible, of some sort of temporary order was called for in the interests of education. Measures that were complicated, and therefore, even in normal times, difficult to carry out, were useless.

The teachers' associations, which under other conditions could have had a real influence on the work of secondary schools, did nothing. They had themselves become disorganized owing to political differences. The first All-Russian Congress of Secondary School-Teachers, which had already taken place in the early summer of 1917, passed resolutions on the problems of school administration. In the existing circumstances, the resolutions remained nothing more than mere aspirations. The first All-Russian Conference of Secondary School Pupils, which took place in May 1917, was really the outcome of a desire for imitation. It was, moreover, entirely absorbed in the struggle between socialistic and anti-socialistic tendencies.

The only measure of practical value adopted in the sphere of education was the reform of Russian spelling, in the early summer of 1917.

The secondary schools began their school year 1917-1918 without any recognized leadership; nor had any new law or decree been passed guaranteeing their security and efficiency. There was a complete lack of authority in the central department and routine work was utterly neglected. The district curators, being deprived of their immediate assistants, were entirely cut off from the secondary schools. The protracted government crisis tended to create an atmosphere of uncertainty and apprehension, which could not but have

its influence on the school work. Nevertheless, nothing exceptional happened during the first month's work in the secondary schools. It is true, a number of minor difficulties arose. In the junior classes, conditions might even have been considered normal. The difficulties experienced here were entirely due to the lack of textbooks and the like. Also, owing to the shortage of food and high prices, it was found impossible adequately to organize the serving of hot luncheons. Pupils, too, were often absent, owing to the necessity of waiting in queues at the shops. At first, there was no disorder in the work of the senior classes. Soon, however, a gradual decline in attendance and application became apparent. Cases began to arise of systematic late attendance, absence from lessons, unauthorized departure, refusal to prepare work or to write papers, etc. The majority of such delinquencies might, no doubt, be excused on the ground of the general upheaval. Such factors as the demoralization of the army, the unfortunate turn of events at the front, the ever increasing internal anarchy, the continual rise in prices—all tended to create a most depressing atmosphere. It is certain, however, that to a great extent the demoralization of the pupils was due to the absence of any feeling of responsibility. The old methods of influencing the pupils could no longer be applied, while new methods had not yet been discovered. Secondary schools could find in their state of isolated self-government neither a firm basis of existence, nor a businesslike leadership. Strikes, too, began to occur. First the junior employees in the Department of Public Charitable Institutions (formerly the Department of the Empress Marie) went out on strike. They were followed by the pupils of the schools controlled by the Ministry of Education. At the beginning of October 1917 the pupils of the secondary schools of Tiflis went out on strike and presented demands. These were that representatives of the three senior classes should be admitted as members of the school boards, with a casting vote, and that the number of hours allotted to Latin should be curtailed. A similar strike shortly after took place in Simferopol. In other places, too, preparations for strikes were on foot.

It became evident that the schoolboys also had been seized with the political passions that had been released. Many of the pupils on their return to school in the autumn of 1917 were found to be members of various political parties. Classes became split into hostile

political factions, and the spirit of unity that had hitherto resisted all attacks was thus destroyed.

However bad conditions might be in secondary schools at the beginning of the academic year 1917-1918, they were by no means hopeless. Its state was highly critical, but as yet there was no sign of collapse. Means were always found to settle any conflict that arose. The more serious events, such as strikes, were still exceptional. The schools that most steadfastly withstood the peril were the private secondary schools and those maintained by public bodies. In these schools, the teachers, after many years of effort, succeeded in establishing an internal organization that met all modern requirements. The reforms, which extended to these schools, were already familiar to them. The long-established cordial relations between teachers and pupils were also a guarantee against serious internal trouble. Much worse was the state of those schools in which in 1917 there existed, strictly speaking, no well-established internal organization.

To extricate the schools from the perilous position in which they were placed, an effective leadership was needed, together with at any rate a temporary adaptation of school life to existing new conditions. It was imperative to introduce these as soon as possible, and not to make endless declarations on educational problems, however broad-minded and theoretically perfect such declarations might be. There was, however, to be no such solution. Fate decided otherwise.

Toward the end of October the Bolshevik *coup d'état* took place. From that date, as far as one can judge from apparently impartial and reliable data, the efforts of the Soviet Government to improve the conditions of the elementary and secondary schools have failed.

The Russian school system was not strong enough to exert the influence that the moment demanded from it. A man like Count Ignatiev had long been needed to fill the post of Minister of Education. Such a man was appointed too late. He was, moreover, hindered by the War, and especially by existing political conditions from carrying into effect his projects. The shortsighted school policy of the previous decades bore its fruit. In the general process of disruption that followed the advent of Bolshevism in Russia, the illiteracy of the masses was a potent factor; the Russian schools had not been allowed to combat it in time.

It was to the representative of this mistaken policy that the author of the report presented by the School Committee of the Duma ad-

dressed the words of Aristotle, written more than two thousand years ago:

"No one will deny that the special care of the legislator is to educate youth; for neglect in this matter is detrimental to the political development of the State."

II

RUSSIAN UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS DURING THE WAR

By PAUL J. NOVGOROTSEV

CHAPTER I

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BEFORE THE WAR

Plato says in one of his dialogues concerning the State that it is something solid in its very nature—ὡς ἰσχυρόν τί πόλις ἐστὶ φύσει—however one tries to deform the State, it still persists, owing to some intrinsic force inherent in it. When I meditate on the destinies of the Russian universities,[1] that expression of Plato involuntarily recurs to me. Russian universities during recent years have passed through terrible and unprecedented trials; and yet, in spite of the utter subversion of their foundations, the lamp of learning has not been extinguished in them, scientific thought has not been arrested, the thirst for knowledge has not abated. True, the lamp of learning burns only with a dim light. Yet such is the irresistible impulse to pursue science, to teach, and to learn, that even now, at the end of the year 1923 when I write these lines, I think that I may assert, on the strength of information at my disposal, that in Russia, at least in some fields of learning, a living process of thought is going on, important research work is being done, and the younger generation is engaged in serious study. The Russian mind is still at work at home as well as abroad, notwithstanding persecution and ordeals. Many Russian men of learning have been exiled; they are scattered all over the world, and yet they form one general Academic Union, and wherever possible, in Europe and in the Far East, Russian centers of learning are being founded by them, and university education is being carried on. Every one of these centers formed by Russian professors attracts numbers of Russian students from different corners of the world; these seem to repeat the history of Abelard's disciples, who gathered round him even in his far exile—*quod cum cognovissent scholares, coeperunt undique concurrere.* And like the disciples of Abelard, these young people at times undergo such privations that they resemble hermits rather than students: *eremitae magis quam*

[1] For the sake of brevity the term "university" is used currently in the course of this translation, unless the context indicates the contrary, to signify both the university properly so called and the higher technical and commercial school.

scholares videbantur. The traditional outer framework of university life in Russia has been destroyed, but the spirit of free investigation which pervades it and prompts it to critical thought is alive and ready to resume its activity.

In this essay I propose to tell the story of the Russian universities during the War, down to the end of 1917. I intend to depict the gradual changes that they underwent during the last years, and to show the effect of these changes upon them. But as a preliminary, I must describe them as they were before those changes took place.

It may be stated as a general principle that in all countries the universities are among the institutions that stand closest to public and national life. The structure and the spirit of the universities of any given country reflect the attitude of that country toward learning, its aims, and its meaning. It is quite correct to speak of different types of universities—of the English, French, and German types. In comparison with the oldest universities of Europe, the oldest Russian university, that of Moscow, is still very young, having been founded in 1755; the rest are of still more recent date, and yet, in spite of this fact, the Russian universities already had their own national characteristics toward the second half of the nineteenth century; and later these national characteristics could also be observed in the higher technical schools. Commenting on the fiftieth anniversary of the University of St. Petersburg Professor Spassovich, who was for some time professor in that university, asserts that even before 1861 the University of St. Petersburg "was not of the German or French or English type, but was a type in itself; it was essentially Russian and such as the public requirements had made it." But the same may be said of all Russian universities and higher technical schools in general. Founded primarily with one object—that of training candidates for the Civil Service—the Russian universities gradually grew into real nurseries of national culture. As is invariably noted by all who have studied the history of learning in Russia—of the recent authors I should mention here the names of Lappo-Danilevsky and Struve—the process of nationalization of the Russian universities and of Russian learning first became clearly evident in the nineteenth century and was completed toward the beginning of the twentieth century. Without entering into details, I shall state here only the general opinion that the Russian universities, approaching in their structure very closely to those of Ger-

many, differ essentially from the latter in that they peculiarly combine the elements of idealism and empiricism, of theory and practice.

The Russian system of education of the pre-revolutionary period was by no means unfavorable to the practical application of learning, which it greatly valued, but it gave a wide scope and ascribed the determining influence to the theoretical elements of knowledge. This fact may be observed with particular clearness in the case of the higher technical schools, and even of the commercial schools, where the knowledge imparted to the students was so technical and so essentially practical. In all those schools greater attention was paid to the theoretical subjects, to the elements of pure knowledge than anywhere else in Europe. This is equally true of the universities and higher technical schools, and of the secondary schools. In this peculiar characteristic of the Russian schools we find reflected their attitude toward culture, toward the human ideal. I have no intention either of criticizing or of defending this attitude; I only draw attention to it as evidence of the fact that in the course of the nineteenth century Russia had developed her own national system of education. Her educational institutions became essentially national in their character. As a result of that development, eminent scholars representing various branches of knowledge, such as history, chemistry, philology, biology, mathematics, etc., acquired a world-wide fame, and thenceforth took their share in furthering the general progress of learning in the world. In 1890 Professor Modestov in his survey of Russian learning during the last twenty-five years spoke, as of something new, of this phenomenon which was then attracting notice. It has since attracted attention more than once.

The statutes of the universities have been altered many times; but the fundamental principles of their mode of life shaped themselves, independently of the influence of any statutes, to meet the spiritual demands of the Russian public and in accordance with the views of the professors and the requirements of the students. Attempts have at times been made to remodel and modernize these principles. Thus during the short Ministry of Count Putyatin (1861) it was proposed to adapt the universities to the English model, with corporations, colleges, and tutors. To that plan put forward by the Ministry, Kostomarov opposed, on behalf of the professors, the plan of a free university somewhat like the *Collège de France*, open to all, requiring no examinations and delivering no diplomas. Both these plans failed,

however, and the University Statutes of 1863, which gave autonomy to the universities in general, fixed that mode of life in the universities which began to take shape in the early 'sixties.

Thenceforth began the rapid and constant progress of the Russian universities, followed by that of the higher technical schools. This progress is the more remarkable as it took place under extremely difficult conditions. The more or less free development of the Russian universities began at a time when Russia as a whole was entering the path to a new, freer, and more complicated life; when simultaneously with the growth of public consciousness there began to develop bitter feelings of revolt, which found their way also into the minds of the students. From the 'sixties of the last century on, the Russian universities became the most sensitive barometer of the public feeling. The anti-Government ideas and sentiments, which elsewhere in Europe found unhindered expression in the press, in public meetings, and in parliaments, had in Russia to seek an artificial outlet in forbidden literature and in the students' movement. Troubles, such as strikes and demonstrations, began to occur in the universities. At first they were rare, but since the last years of the nineteenth century had been becoming more and more frequent. Arising originally from academical causes, these disturbances gradually assumed a purely political character. The Government retaliated, expelling the students and admonishing or even in some cases dismissing the professors. In 1884, it adopted a general measure, promulgating the new University Statutes, which subjected the universities to a much stricter supervision by the Government and deprived them of their autonomy. Students' organizations of all kinds were thenceforth forbidden; the students were to be regarded solely as individual members of universities. The faculty lost their leading rôle in the management of the universities. By such methods the Government sought to put an end to disturbances among the students. The following years, however, proved the futility of these measures.

In 1901, examining the Statutes of 1884, Professor Vinogradoff[2] came to the conclusion that those Statutes

did not attain the object they pursued and that which they achieved was hardly worth striving for. The political expectations which pro-

[2] Vinogradoff, *Uchebnoe delo v nashikh universitetakh* (*Teaching in Our Universities*), in *Vestnik Evropi*, 1901.

voked its promulgation were not justified: radical ideas could still exist in the universities inasmuch as they existed in the country and were dependent upon various circumstances. . . . The pacification of the students was not achieved; the conflicts between the students and the university authorities became, on the contrary, more frequent and more pronounced.

Such were the unfavorable circumstances that accompanied the development of the universities: on the one side, there were the disturbances among the students, on the other, the Government reprisals. And yet, in spite of all this, the cause of learning was being steadily advanced, thanks to natural inner impulses which it was impossible to restrain. Of all this pre-revolutionary period the most trying years for the Russian universities were the last decade before the War. During that decade a good deal happened to which we shall have to return, but which must be mentioned here.

The Russo-Japanese War brought about, as a result of its heavy reverses, a sharp increase of anti-Government feeling in the country. That feeling rapidly spread to the universities. After the workers' demonstration, headed by the priest Gapon, in St. Petersburg on January 9, 1905,[3] the students were seized with violent political excitement. The resumption of work in the universities after the Christmas recess of 1904-1905 was rendered impossible by this general excitement. The faculties realized that any attempt to resume lectures would have disastrous results for the students; they accordingly petitioned that the commencement of term should be postponed. These conditions lasted throughout the term. In the autumn the Government decided to try a new policy with regard to the universities, of attempting to restore their autonomy and thus shifting the responsibility for all university affairs upon the university councils and the rectors chosen by them. Such was the purport of the Imperial ukase of August 27, 1905. The promulgation of this ukase coincided with a new wave of revolutionary excitement. In the autumn of 1905 it pervaded the whole country, and the attempt to resume normal academic work again collapsed. The groups of the students of the Left demanded that the universities should be opened to serve as a "revolutionary tribune." They actually became the scene of meetings and public demonstrations. Regular academic work was

[3] All dates are in accordance with the Russian calendar.

again brought to a standstill for another year, till the political excitement had cooled down.

The years 1905 and 1906 were critical for Russian students, and this fact was again closely connected with the deep processes in the life of the whole country. Out of the storms and disturbances of 1905 Russia emerged in possession of representative institutions. For the first time political parties with definite programs, with their own press and organizations, came into the open. This at once resulted in a party division among the students. Up to 1905 the Russian students at least appeared united, if they were not so in reality. The revolutionary groups of the Left prevailed among them; they were connected with the revolutionary socialist organizations. Moderate and Right groups did also exist, of course, but they were badly organized, and at times of crisis their feeble, discordant voices were usually completely lost in the general excitement; the more so, since the groups of the Left always managed to connect their political demonstrations with the familiar and manifest defects in the university statutes and in university life in general. After 1905, when the political life of the country had settled down, both these groups of students, the Right and the Moderate, were formed into independent party organizations.

There were, moreover, many subdivisions among the Right, Left, and Moderate students. Thus, in the University of Yuriev (Dorpat) there were more than 30 subdivisions, in the Mining Institute of Petersburg there were 24, in the Technological (Engineering) Institute, 18. Subsequently a central group was formed among university students, consisting chiefly of the Constitutional-Democrats, or Cadets (also called the People's Freedom Party). This meant an end of the prevalence of the parties of the Left in the universities. They did not, however, disappear altogether, but became in their turn better organized and more active. Sometimes they preserved their numerical majority, but even in the most democratic schools they were thenceforth counterbalanced by the moderate political groups and by non-party elements. Thus, according to the students' census of 1907 in the University of Yuriev, which had always shown a great preponderance of students of the Left, the proportion of students belonging to the organizations of the Left (Anarchists, Social-Democrats, Social-Revolutionaries, etc.) was 66.39 per cent. But there were also organized Right and Moderate groups, besides stu-

dents belonging to no party; the Constitutional-Democrats numbered 11.47 per cent; the Right and non-party students, 16.55 per cent. According to the census of the St. Petersburg Technological Institute of the same date, there were 20 per cent of Constitutional-Democrats and 20 per cent of non-party students; for the Polytechnic Institute of St. Petersburg the figures were: Constitutional-Democrats, 15.5 per cent; non-party, 28.2 per cent.

Even at the elections to the students' organizations the first places were sometimes won by Moderate candidates belonging to the Constitutional-Democratic Party. These elements usually upheld the authority of the faculty and protested against political demonstrations. In the students' economic organizations, such as relief funds, canteens, etc., they took their stand on purely economic grounds. The Left groups, who called themselves "democratic students," were strongly opposed to them. They were, in fact, affiliated to the revolutionary socialist parties and strictly maintained the old revolutionary tradition of that section of students, using every opportunity to organize a revolutionary demonstration. They objected to the narrow-minded "economism," as they called it, of the students' organizations, and were usually at variance with the faculty because of the latter's anti-political tendencies and of their bourgeois ideology. There were some who demanded the so-called democratization of the universities, implying by this, on the one hand, the participation of students in the administration of the universities, and, on the other hand, a remodelling of the program of study on the basis of the "free coöperation of students and professors." According to this scheme, the professors were only to help the students in their studies. The principal aspirations of this section of the students were formulated as follows in 1912 in *The Students' Cause*,[4] the organ of the students of the Left, published in Moscow: "Our aim is that every students' organization should always regard itself as part of a general students' movement, that it should teach its members to aspire to great and important ends, instead of confining itself to paltry calculations." The "great and important ends" of this section of students were implied in their connection with the general labor and democratic movement in the country, whose aim was not only a political, but also a social revolution. The Right wing, on the contrary, was engaged in actively combating revolutionary ideas. This section of

[4] *Moskovskoe Studencheskoe Delo.*

the students also came into frequent conflict with university authorities, because of its forcible demands that order should be reestablished.

We may hold different views upon the political groups among the Russian students of that time. In the light of a mature political experience they may seem in many respects childish and imperfect. But there is no denying that they afford evidence of a curious fact, namely, a sharp social differentiation between the students, coupled with the growth of their political consciousness. During the discussion of the university question in the Duma in 1911, the parties of the Right and of the Left (Shulgin and Purishkevich on the one side and Gegechkori on the other) agreed in pointing out the connection between the revolutionary students' groups and the poorest classes of the population. They noted their impecunious condition as one of the main causes of discontent and disturbance. As the Social-Democrat Gegechkori put it, the students' movement had "to hearken to the Labor movement which has already taken a definite form, and to respond to it." The appearance in the universities of the Moderate and Right groups showed that new influences, hostile to revolution, were beginning to gain ascendancy over the students. Among other things, the growing strength of the Moderate parties clearly showed the increasing influence of the liberal professorial circles. We cannot help seeing in this a beneficial result of the ukase of August 27, 1905, which restored to the universities the opportunity of organizing more freely their own life, and raised the prestige of the faculty.

But apart from the political division between the students and in connection with the fact that a considerable number of them were losing their interest in politics, a tendency had manifested itself among them, since 1905, to participate in societies and associations of all kinds. The ukase of August 27, 1905 allowed the university administrations to authorize the existence of students' organizations. Numerous student associations, economic, regional, national, scientific, religious, artistic, etc., at once sprang into being. If such organizations had previously existed, often even surreptitiously, by virtue of a natural necessity, now that their status was legally recognized, they were on firmer ground, and grew both in number and in power. In the first place we must mention the extraordinary growth of economic associations designed to meet the material needs of the students. Of all European students, the Russian students were cer-

tainly the most impecunious. As Professor Novikov justly remarked poverty was something quite normal in the life of the Russian student.

Owing to the wide admission of all classes, to the comparatively low tuition fees, and to the large number of grants and scholarships of all sorts, Russian universities were always noted for their democratic character. According to the data of M. Gordon,[5] the proportion of impecunious students in Russian universities amounted in the years preceding the War to about 53 per cent. In some towns the proportion was considerably higher. For instance in the University of Yuriev it reached 83 per cent. The percentage of the impecunious was also very high in Petrograd, where among men students 72 per cent were reckoned as impecunious, while among women it was still higher, namely, 82 per cent. Most favorable was the position in the university and higher technical schools of Kiev, where the percentage of impecunious students was only 45, and yet even here it was nearly one in every two.

Thus, more than one-half of the Russian students were able to pursue and complete their studies in the universities only provided they had some earnings (and not all could have them), or subsidies from the Government, from a public organization, or from a private source. According to the statistics contained in the report of the Ministry of Education for 1912, in ten Russian universities a sum of 573,989 rubles[6] was spent on scholarships and 144,374 rubles on temporary allowances, while the remaining higher schools of the same Ministry spent 153,459 rubles on scholarships and 30,132 rubles on temporary allowances. But this was only a small portion of the help received by the students. Besides the scholarships granted by the universities out of funds received from private sources and from organizations, there existed various charitable institutions specially founded to this end. Their aid was a useful supplement to the existing scholarships. Thus, for instance, in 1913, in the University of Moscow, scholarships were paid out to the value of 190,000 rubles, and 20,000 rubles was spent on temporary allowances; moreover, 1,300 students were exempted from tuition fees. During the same year the Society for the Relief of the Impecunious Students of Mos-

[5] *Vestnik Vospitanya* (*The Messenger of Education*), October, 1914.

[6] One ruble was equal to 2*s.* 1*d.*

cow University paid 44,374 rubles on account of tuition fees for 1,460 students, 2,470 rubles in temporary allowances, and distributed 130,000 free meals in its canteen; reckoned at the current prices the value of these meals represented about 50,000 rubles. The assistance given by the Government and by public bodies was, even before 1905, supplemented by the regional societies (*zemlyachestva*) in which were united for the sake of intercourse and mutual-aid people who were natives of the same locality—province, district, or region. After 1905 and especially after the new regulations of July 11, 1907, the number of these organizations grew considerably. They maintained their connection with their place of origin, whence they usually received support. Besides this old and popular form of association, there were other mutual relief societies in which students were combined and received help irrespective of the place of their birth.

This tendency to mutual help led, toward the end of the period in question (1905-1914) to the proposal and partial adoption of a scheme of financial assistance based on the principle of coöperation. Some of the students' groups thought even of renouncing all charitable assistance and depending thenceforth entirely upon coöperation. For this purpose it was thought necessary to establish a connection with the general non-student coöperative bodies, which had acquired at that time great importance and economic power. This plan was certainly much in advance of the times; it was even utopian, but it was characteristic of the growing activity of the students at that period. According to information furnished by M. Trofimov,[7] scores of mutual relief organizations and consumers' societies, and hundreds of regional societies, existed in the Russian universities at the beginning of the War. Their cash resources amounted to many hundreds of thousands of rubles, and their turnover ran into several millions.

Lastly, during the same period, numerous scientific, artistic, and religious groups sprang up among the students. The awakening of religious needs and interests among the younger generation was a new and particularly interesting feature of the epoch. As Professor Vernadsky, a Fellow of the Russian Academy of Sciences and a competent observer of the life of the universities, said in 1913,

[7] M. Trofimov, in the almanac *Put Studenchestva* (*The Students' Path*).

In the growth of religious societies among the Russian students is manifested the freedom of personality. Until recently all religious sentiments were concealed and repressed here. Religious organizations were impossible because neither personal nor national culture stood foremost among the ideals of life. The happiness of the masses was the dominant ideal, and the tasks of economic and political emancipation were considered as all-important, overshadowing everything else. As soon as personal and national culture became ideals as potent as the others, religious needs and problems that had not hitherto manifested themselves in the life of the students in any organized way, also came to the surface.

On this ground the religious organizations of the Russian students came into touch with the world-wide Students' Christian Movement, and this in itself was quite a new thing for Russian students, who had previously had no links with the students of other countries except in so far as they belonged to the international socialist movement. For other students participation in various scientific and artistic clubs and societies meant the same emancipation of their personality from the all-absorbing influence of politics. In the eyes of a considerable section of students, politics in general, and not only the politics of the Left, had lost during this period their predominant importance; new and varied interests, both economic and spiritual, took their place. It was no doubt a good thing, but it might not have been noticed at once by a superficial observer, for this process was going on deep in the minds of the students, being the result of some hidden yet fertile influence. No doubt, alongside of this, certain aspects of Russian student life at that day were less commendable. Not all the students took an interest in their studies or in the work of various societies. There were still a considerable number who spent their time in idleness and amusements.

Precisely at this moment, when the great wave of revolutionary excitement had gradually ebbed away and people were left again to their ordinary occupations, some sections of the younger generation showed their egotism and their bad taste. Pornographic novels by Artsibashev and Madame Verbitsky acquired great popularity. But it would be an injustice to the students if behind these negative phenomena we lost sight of the great positive effort toward self-determination and self-organization which they were making. If the students of that period were often blamed for having forgotten

the traditional notions of public service and for taking greater interest in sports, flirting, night revels, etc., these reproaches were dictated either by the desire that the students should above all actively participate in the political struggle, or by the failure to perceive the many-sided character of the students' life. Figures always supply the best evidence; it will suffice therefore to mention here that as early as 1909 there were in the University of Moscow 115 students' organizations, of which 75 were mutual-aid associations; in the University of St. Petersburg there were at that time 65 scientific societies, 163 regional societies and similar organizations, 7 big relief funds, and 8 corporations. These figures bear witness to the organizing effort on the part of the students of that epoch.

There was, moreover, another evident sign of the variety and vigor of the students' activities at that time. I refer to the appearance after 1905 of a large number of students' magazines. In 1907, there were two of them worth mentioning: *Vestnik Studenchestva* (*Students' Messenger*) in Moscow and *Studenchestvo* (*The Students*) in St. Petersburg. Afterward their number began to grow rapidly; and in 1910, according to M. Svatikov, who made a special study of the students' press of that epoch, all possible shades of students' opinions were reflected in their press. These included the Right, or militant Academic movement, as it was called, whose purpose was to fight the revolution; the peaceful Academic movement with its slight tinge of liberalism; the Students' Christian Movement; the Democratic Professionalist movement, which endeavored to link the economic organizations of the students with the general democratic movement; the so-called Narrow Economism movement, which was opposed to this last and confined itself to purely economic objects; the extreme political currents of Social-Democrats and Social-Revolutionaries; and, lastly, purely literary coteries, which advocated art for art's sake. A well-known Russian journalist, M. Isgoev, rightly pointed out in January 1911 (in the newspaper *Rech*) that the students' press disclosed "some serious and interesting processes at work among the students." These processes may be characterized as a living spiritual quest which easily outgrew the domain of politics. It testified to the obvious demand for freedom and breadth of opinion. Certain organs of the students' press, such as *Vestnik Studenchestva* (*Students' Messenger*), *Golos Studenchestva* (*Students' Voice*), *Studencheskoe Delo* (*Students' Cause*),

Studencheski Mir (*Students' World*) in Moscow, *Studencheskie Godi* (*Students' Years*), *Utro Zhizni* (*Morning of Life*) in St. Petersburg, and *Studencheskaya Misl* (*Students' Thought*) in Kiev, were upholding the old revolutionary traditions; but the newly formed groups of moderate students of various shades ran their own magazines in opposition to these organs and carried on a lively polemic with them.

Finally, we must mention another important phenomenon in the life of Russian students, which became manifest at this time. Throughout the nineteenth century, Russian students had for the most part shown a keen interest either in the most abstract scientific and philosophic problems, or in political questions. The interest in theoretical problems or in the duties of social work was decidedly predominant. The higher technical schools always attracted a certain number of students, but the university provided the most popular and common form of higher education. After 1905, a radical change took place in the minds of the students, whose thoughts were now turned to the practical application of knowledge. Professor Vernadsky, whom I have already had occasion to quote, in his survey of the life of the universities written in 1913 compared this phenomenon with similar developments in other countries, and characterized it by saying that "the students are beginning to realize the necessity of exercising their will; of training it and of applying it to some kind of activity. It is being more and more realized that the will as such, and the act of will brought into life, are just as valuable manifestations of human personality as abstract knowledge, or sentimental emotion, or poetical inspiration." For this there were many reasons: the general technical progress of the world, the foundation in Russia of several new higher technical schools, and the longing for practical work coupled with a high appreciation of it on the part of the students. Even before 1905, from the end of the nineteenth century onward, polytechnic schools, excellently organized, began to appear in Russia: in St. Petersburg, Kiev, Warsaw, and Tomsk. A new school of mining was opened in Ekaterinoslav; a higher school of engineering was created in Moscow, and so on. After 1905, higher commercial schools, under the name of commercial institutes, were founded in Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov, and St. Petersburg. The programs were wide, and some of them, for instance in Moscow and Kiev, had attracted by 1914 a very great number of students (over

6,000 in Moscow). The development and the progress of these schools were undoubtedly due to the aforesaid thirst for practical work and practical knowledge among the students.

Another outcome of this was the opening of several new higher technical schools. Some of the old schools were enlarged. The Engineering School of Moscow was transformed into the Institute of Railway Engineering, and placed on the same footing as the one which was already in existence in St. Petersburg. To the Moscow Agricultural Institute was added a new School of Fisheries; an Agricultural Institute was founded in Voronezh; preparations were made for the opening of a School of Mining in Ekaterinburg and of polytechnic institutes in Samara and in Tiflis, and so on. Several local petitions for the opening of higher technical schools did not during this period go beyond the stage of preliminary discussion. In Siberia, for instance, five large towns competed as to which was to have an agricultural institute. Requests for the opening of higher technical schools poured into St. Petersburg from all parts of Russia. The Russian public was well aware of the extreme and urgent importance of higher education, both in its university and in its technical variety. And it should be said that although in 1914 there were in Russia considerably more than one hundred universities and higher technical schools with about 150,000 students, this was certainly not enough, having regard to the size and requirements of the Russian State. During the short period from 1905 to the beginning of the War the number of students more than doubled, and yet the existing schools, whose number was constantly growing, could not find room for all who wished to enter them, so great was the ardent desire for higher education among all classes. The statistics showed a growing percentage of peasants and small bourgeoisie among the students of the universities and higher technical schools.

I have given these details in order to show in the most concrete and vivid manner the situation of the Russian universities before the War. But I should be omitting a very characteristic feature of that situation if I did not mention that the extremely rapid growth which I have just described met with no encouragement on the part of the principal organ that had charge of the schools in Russia, namely, the Ministry of Education, and was even hampered by it. Not all higher technical and secondary schools of Russia were controlled by the Ministry of Education; commercial and polytechnic

schools were in the charge of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry; agricultural schools in that of the Department of Agriculture, etc. As a matter of fact these departments did much more for higher education during the period in question than the Ministry of Education. The reason for this most unusual development was that the Ministry, still fearing revolutionary outbursts, continued to follow the path of reprisals and to view with great suspicion the growth of the universities. After 1905 that policy found a supporter in the person of the President of the Council of Ministers, M. Stolypin. Accordingly, the universities had to undergo the severe ordeals of which we have already spoken. This was the more regrettable, since, as we have already pointed out, after 1905 the revolutionary groups lost their ascendancy in the universities, and new currents appeared, hostile not only to the old political bias, but to political tendencies in general. It was no doubt impossible that the revolutionary currents should disappear altogether from the universities so long as they existed in the country; they could be eradicated or disarmed only by far-reaching reforms. Stolypin began one of the most urgent reforms, that of the agrarian situation. But the conditions of Russian political life prevented the completion of his really important undertaking.

At the same time, in the general policy of the Government the line of narrow conservatism was becoming more and more pronounced. Instead of satisfying the sound demands of the public, the Government sought support in the restricted circles of the parties of the extreme Right. Even moderate elements were looked upon with suspicion. In its fear of revolution, the Government often fought against its ghost, and instead of achieving pacification by a policy of magnanimity, it was begetting the spirit of discontent by its tactics of distrust and exclusiveness. But if the Government did not have enough moral force, breadth of outlook, and courage to keep pace with the claims of life, the public on its part, having become accustomed during the long years of political inactivity and political abstraction to play the part of irresponsible opposition, was unable to show a genuine statesmanlike understanding of the situation, to take into account the conditions in which the Government had to act, or the limit of its possibilities. In a country which had produced such eminent repudiators of the State as Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Tolstoi, it was hardly to be expected that these nihilistic ideas would prove

merely accidental or imported, and would not respond to some inalienable propensity of the Russian mind. In fact, it was hard to make the Russian intelligentsia, brought up in an atmosphere of unceasing struggle against the Government, understand the imperialist policy of the Government and the essential character of the latter. Thus, whereas the Government was loath to acknowledge the legitimate demands of the public, the public was unable to grasp the meaning of State authority and the conditions of its exercise.

This tragic split between the Government and the public serves to explain the sad and amazing fact in the pre-war history of Russian education which cannot be described otherwise than as the war of the Government against the universities. The first years of Stolypin's Government coincided with a certain relaxation in the students' political activities. After the dissolution of the First Duma on July 9, 1906, there came a period of political tranquillity throughout the country. Even the promulgation of the new Franchise Act of June 3, 1907, disfranchising a great number of electors and introducing fresh restrictions, did not provoke any ostensible protests or discontent. Cases of pillage, seizure of land, and murder, which recalled the recent period of anarchy, were gradually becoming rarer. Under these conditions of relative calm the students applied themselves with great zeal and ardor to their studies and to those internal activities which we have already discussed. When in the autumn of 1906 the work in the universities was resumed, it at once took a quieter and more normal course. It was long since the lecture rooms and the laboratories of the universities had been so well filled and since the professors had had such attentive audiences. The students tried, as it were, to recover the time they had lost, and to satisfy a craving for knowledge that had hitherto remained unsatisfied. At the same time there was an intensification of scientific work among the professors, who were given an opportunity of greater concentration on research. The normal course of academic life was, it is true, somewhat disturbed by students' demonstrations, but they were not so violent as during the stormy period of 1905. The anti-Government spirit, however, and revolutionary aspirations had not been eliminated among the students any more than they had been eliminated from the country; and as early as 1910 these feelings of revolt showed signs of increase.

It was then that Stolypin decided to put an end once for all to the

revolutionary outbreaks, and therefore turned his attention to the universities, in which he saw one of the principal hotbeds of sedition. Foreseeing the growth of anti-Government tendencies and wishing to stem it, he decided to quell the universities with a strong hand. With this object in view he appointed in the autumn of 1910 a new Minister of Education, choosing a man who, though himself a professor, was by his spirit and breeding absolutely alien to the spirit and traditions of the Russian universities. It was M. Kasso. He came of a Rumanian family of Bessarabia and was educated abroad. If his predecessors did not always look with sufficient reverence upon Russian learning, he was a man completely indifferent to national achievements and to the peculiarities of Russian universities. He did not hesitate to dismiss from the universities the best Russian scholars, to interfere with the work of the most eminent scientific institutions, to break with the glorious traditions of learning, or to expel hundreds of students from the universities as soon as trouble broke out. He viewed university teaching from the standpoint of scholastic professionalism, which he wanted to implant in the Russian universities, thus killing their independence and originality.

The new wave of students' disturbances, which began in November 1910, served as a pretext for severe reprisals. On November 7, Tolstoi died, and the death of the great Russian writer produced an immense impression upon the Russian public, including the students. The latter everywhere organized meetings in his memory, stopped work, and showed signs of great emotion. The revolutionaries hastened, as usual, to seize this opportunity for demonstrations; this coincided with certain regrettable incidents in the prisons of Vologda and Zerentuy, where some political prisoners were beaten by the warders. Thus the end of 1910 again saw a stormy outburst of students' protests. The Christmas vacations brought a natural pacification. But before work was resumed, a decision of the Council of Ministers was published forbidding all meetings in the universities except those held for purely academic purposes. With a complete disregard of university autonomy and existing traditions, the police were thenceforth allowed to enter on university premises, without being summoned by the university authorities, on the slightest suspicion that students' meetings were being held. To this decision the students almost everywhere replied by violent demonstrations, and even went to the length of proclaiming a strike, which was to last through-

out the term. The conflict assumed a particularly violent character in the University of Moscow. As usual, the declaration of the strike by the students was strongly resented by the professors, and the University Council was prepared to adopt extreme measures to combat it and to insist on the continuation of work. But the university authorities were placed in a quite novel position by the order of January 11, 1911. The police might now come into the university building without their knowledge and act upon instructions from their chiefs. The result was that after the first appearance of the police in the University, the Rector, Professor Manuilov, and his two Deputies, Professor Menzbir and Professor Minakov, resigned, asserting that the right given to the police to enter on university premises "was creating an absolutely inadmissible division of power." The Minister of Education regarded this as a new anti-Government demonstration and dismissed all three professors. Upon this, twenty-one professors and over eighty other members of the faculty resigned in their turn. At the same time, students were expelled *en masse* from the Moscow and other universities.

These events occurred in February 1911. The press unanimously condemned the Government. The point of view then shared by all the moderate elements of Russian public opinion found its expression in the editorial article of the review *Russkaya Misl* (*Russian Thought*).[8] "The extremists having chosen the universities as the sphere of their influence, have turned them with brutal heedlessness into an arena of political experiments. But did not the Government show the same lack of regard for higher education as such, when in its insane desire to establish order at all costs it applied to the complex organism of the universities the most primitive police remedies?" Pursuing the same trend of thought, another writer, M. Isgoev, appealed to the progressive section of the Russian public to protect the universities. "They represent," he said, "that cultured stratum which lies between revolution and reaction, and upon which the future of Russia depends; we must hand them over neither to the mob, nor to the reactionary clique." In saying this he reiterated the appeal which had been so forcibly and eloquently launched in 1910 by Professor Pokrovsky, when he demanded in *Polyarnaya Zvezda* (*The Polar Star*) that our schools should "cease to be the war camp and the fighting post of the belligerent parties." "Let us remove our

[8] *Russkaya Misl,* March 1911. This review was edited by Peter B. Struve.

arms," said Professor Pokrovsky, "let us lead our horses out of the temple, for a temple is a temple, and not a war camp. It holds the sacred objects created and preserved by countless generations; in it flows the source for lack of which the future generations will be doomed. I address my appeal to all political parties. Let us sign a Geneva convention. Let us hoist a Red Cross flag over our schools."

All these opinions, as well as the events described above, emphasize the exceptionally difficult conditions in which higher education was developing in Russia. The worst was that neither the extremists nor the Government had any regard whatever for the universities. In the last years preceding the War the Ministry of Education took most drastic measures in order to destroy the last remnants of independence of the faculties and of their members. After the severe punishment inflicted upon the University of Moscow came the turn of other universities. The Minister made large use of his right to appoint, to dismiss, and to transfer professors, and to invalidate the appointment of those chosen by the university councils. He selected new professors not on account of their academic merits, but because of their political "reliability." He inflicted punishments upon those who dared to utter an independent opinion on university affairs, thereby depriving the universities of some of their most eminent members. All this could result only in the "degradation of teaching and of academic work, in the growth of discontent and indignation, and in academic indifference," as Professor Vernadsky wrote at the end of 1913.

Time has shown how completely mistaken was the view that Russian universities were the principal hotbeds of revolutionary fermentation. When, at the beginning of the Revolution of 1917, the dismissed professors and students returned to their universities, it was precisely these and some of the higher technical schools, that proved to be the mainstay of order and patriotism. And before the Revolution, during the War, many a student fought disinterestedly for his country. Stolypin's policy with regard to the universities served no purpose so far as the struggle against revolution was concerned, but it did great harm to education in Russia. It only irritated unnecessarily the moderate elements, while it failed to arrest the activities of the extremists. Just before the War there were sporadic outbursts of students' disturbances; and discontent, which had for some time been kept in check by the fear of severe reprisals, began

to manifest itself anew. It was aroused by various causes. Events quite outside the bounds of university life excited the students more deeply and more frequently than the shortcomings of the university life itself. This was clearly due to general political causes, which, while they could not be counteracted by academic measures, were actually intensified by academic restrictions. And yet, notwithstanding all the oppression from above, university life went on in its own way.

The struggle of the Russian people to secure the opening of new universities, which we have described above, was progressing unremittingly; if it failed of its purpose with the Ministry of Education, it looked for and found satisfaction elsewhere in other government departments. If it was impossible to open new universities, new technical and other schools were being founded. Many of the professors dismissed from the State universities found refuge in these new schools. And though punishments were inflicted upon the students, the work of self-organization and self-determination could not be stopped, and was quietly proceeding. The differentiation of students, of which we spoke above, grew and became a stable fact. By 1914 it was quite obvious that the Russian students were not a single whole, united by common ideas and feelings. The Right and the Moderate elements, and those which took no interest in politics at all, gained a firm footing among the students, but neither did the parties of the Left disappear.

According to the unanimous evidence of the students' press of that time, there was from the end of 1912 a tendency toward greater activity among the students. The Radical students' press made its reappearance and began to talk of "great and important ends." Under the influence of the elements of the Left, students' demonstrations were organized in 1913 and 1914 in connection with the alteration of the Statutes of the Military Medical Academy and with the severe suppression of the disorders in the Lena gold fields. This growth of the activity of the groups of the Left was not accidental; it corresponded with the new development of revolutionary feeling in the country. The economic surveys of that time refer to the increase of solidarity among the workers and to the growth of the strike movement. Without entering into an analysis of this development, I shall confine myself to stating that it reached its culminating point toward the end of the pre-war period. This is how the news-

paper *Rech*, in its issue of July 14, 1914,[9] described the last outburst of the workers' movement before the War:

During the last week attention has been concentrated on the strike, which has lasted throughout the week. There have been so many strikes during this last year, and they were due to so many different causes, that when the sympathetic strike with the oil-field workers of the Baku region was declared, there was no reason to attach any special importance to it. But instead of ending the next day, as was expected, the strike began to spread, both outwardly and inwardly, assuming a character of increasing aggressiveness. The workers showed extreme exasperation, built barricades and prepared ambushes, stoned the police and resorted to firearms, which in its turn provoked the use of the same weapons by the police and by the troops. The excitement of the workers of St. Petersburg is spreading to other towns.

Toward the end of the week the strike was approaching an end, but the exasperation which accompanied it bore witness to the accumulated revolutionary sentiment among the workers. At this juncture came the outbreak of the World War, an event as little foreseen by the academic world as by the rest of Russia.

[9] *See* p. 137, n. 3.

CHAPTER II

UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS DURING THE WAR, UP TO THE REVOLUTION OF FEBRUARY 1917

The entry of Russia into the World War, like that of other countries, was accompanied by a general outburst of patriotism. All existing divisions and grievances were forgotten. All internal quarrels were silenced in the face of this great danger from without. Immediately on the outbreak of war, all fears as to the possible manifestation of hostility to the Government that might have existed before the War were dissipated. Newspapers of that time have preserved for us a faithful record of the sudden change wrought in the public mentality by the War. Five days before the War broke out, on July 14, martial law was proclaimed by the Government in the Moscow and Petrograd provinces and in both capitals. In Petrograd the work in the factories was resumed on July 14,[1] but in Moscow the strike only commenced on that day at the Prokhorov cotton mills and the adjacent factories. And yet as soon as the news spread of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, patriotic manifestations began in Petrograd, Moscow, and other cities. These even called forth a government proclamation, on July 16, appealing to the Russian public to preserve "tranquillity and reserve" and declaring that "the Imperial Government is watching over the dignity and interests of Russia." These patriotic manifestations continued and even increased during the first days after the commencement of hostilities. Their spontaneous character and their magnitude clearly showed how deeply the feelings of the large masses of the Russian people were affected. Men and women of all conditions and classes of society united in these displays of patriotic sentiment. All felt as if a single heart were beating in them. Soldiers and officers, for the most part destined soon to be sent to the Army, were the center of general attention and enthusiastic ovations. Every nation that lived through the last War has a vivid recollection of these pictures of emotion on the outbreak of hostilities.

[1] *See* p. 137, n. 3.

The general enthusiasm which found its simple and unsophisticated expression in the popular manifestations, in the legislative assemblies took the shape of solemn declarations and appeals for unity. The solitary voice of the representative of the Social-Democratic Party, who protested against the War from the point of view of international socialism, was drowned in the general patriotic chorus. This general sentiment was reëchoed in the press. In the newspaper *Rech*[2] we find the following declaration, which may be taken to represent faithfully the feelings of the large progressive circles of Russian public opinion at that time: "Whatever may be our attitude toward the home policy of the Government, our primary duty is to preserve the unity of our country and to maintain her position among other nations, while her enemies are trying to impair that position. Let us then set aside our own quarrels and give our enemies no reason to build hopes upon our dissensions." Such was then the general desire for national unity and patriotic service. It goes without saying that Russian universities could not remain outside this general current.

As the War broke out in July, during the summer vacation, complete quiet prevailed at the time in the universities. Work began as usual in September, six weeks after the beginning of hostilities. By then Russia had already known her first military successes and her first and severe reverses. In the middle of August the army of General Samsonov perished in East Prussia. At that stage of the War it was a most grievous blow to Russia and to her national consciousness. And when the councils of the universities and higher technical schools first met and put forth their patriotic declarations, they were fully aware of all the difficulties and dangers of the incipient war. All the more ardently did they share the general enthusiasm for national unity which pervaded the country. One university after another addressed telegrams to the Emperor solemnly promising to give all their forces to the service of the nation.

It may seem strange that while Russian professors with one accord gave vent to this patriotic fervor, they at the same time condemned so severely the famous manifesto of ninety-three German professors issued at the beginning of the War. Was not the manifesto of these Germans an expression of patriotism and loyalty to their Army, of which other countries furnished examples? Had not men

[2] *Rech,* July 22, 1914, No. 193.

of learning in each country the moral right to support their Government and their people in the world struggle? I must say that in Russia general surprise was provoked not by the fact of German savants defending their country, but by the nature of this defense. German professors asserted that the system of militarism against which all countries took their stand and in the overthrow of which the Powers opposed to Germany saw one of the main objects of the War—that this system was one of the mainstays of German culture. "It is not true," they said, "that the struggle against what is called our militarism is not directed against our culture, as our hypocritical enemies pretend. Without our militarism our culture would long since have been destroyed. It was for the defense of that culture that militarism sprang up in our country, which, more than any other, has been for centuries exposed to attacks from the outside."

In other words, the German scholars contended that German militarism and German culture were inseparably bound together, that German culture without the support of militarism would have perished. Yet this had not been the perspective of the age to which German culture owed most. Schiller and Goethe praised the rule of ideal forms and principles in the world; Kant appealed for "eternal peace"; while his brilliant successors spoke of the coming triumph of reason and of the growing consciousness of freedom. All who bore in mind the great behests of German thought believed that these were opposed to militarism. There was a subtle and yet clearly discernible spiritual border line between the love for one's army inherent in every nation and the cult of militarism as a system. The Russian academic world was puzzled when it saw men of learning defend not only the army, but militarism as such, and show not only patriotic loyalty to their people, but also a chauvinistic desire to see their people ruling over the world by force of arms. This is the sense in which the Russian reply to the German professors is to be understood. But perhaps these feelings and ideas have found their best expression in the appeal of Russian writers and artists to their country and to the whole civilized world:

It seems that Germany, forgetting her glorious past, is returning to the altars of those cruel national gods to defeat whom our Lord incarnated Himself on earth. . . . The seeds of national conceit and hatred sown by Germany are already blossoming forth. The flame of hatred

set ablaze by Germany is threatening to spread to other countries. And then the voices of men blinded by wrath will loudly call for revenge, and renounce even all the great and beautiful things that have been created by German genius for the joy and use of all mankind.

Such were the fears and forebodings expressed by the Russian public in connection with the manifesto of the German professors. The War was conceived by Russians primarily as for the defense of Serbia, for the liberation of Slavonic peoples and for common protection against militarism, and if the chauvinistic spirit did at times take possession of certain elements of the Russian public, it never met with wide support, but on the contrary was severely condemned.

The mental attitude of the students of the universities was quite in keeping with that of the professors and of the whole Russian nation. The change in the younger generation wrought by the War was particularly striking. The currents of opposition and revolt which, in spite of all the stern measures applied by M. Kasso,[3] manifested themselves so sharply among the students, especially in the last years before the War, suddenly disappeared as if dispelled by some magic wand. Needless to say that even in those days of general patriotic enthusiasm and unity, there remained among the students, just as among the general public, political extremists who stuck to their revolutionary internationalist ideas. But for the time being they kept in the background, oppressed and stifled, as it were, by the general display of patriotism around them. In one of the Socialist magazines of that epoch we find in an article by M. Kleinbort[4] an interesting confirmation of the fact that patriotic enthusiasm seemed at that time general and undivided. "The rising wave which has swept the country," said M. Kleinbort,

> the complexity of the tasks that are facing us, the abnormal atmosphere in which we live, all that compels one to take sides in the struggle and to be active—all this has had a great effect on the younger generation. Outwardly it is the same feeling that is already familiar to us, which we saw displayed in the moments of national calamity, in the moments of historic decisions. The young are carried away by some spontaneous force which is the more intense the more it is based upon sentiment.

[3] Minister of Education from 1908 to 1914.

[4] Kleinbort, *Moldezh i voina* (*The Younger Generation and the War*), in *Sovremenni Mir* (*Contemporary World*), November, 1914.

M. Kleinbort is right in making no exceptions; indeed, in those days there were no exceptions to be found among the young. He is also right in describing the general feeling as that which is aroused in moments of national calamities and historic decisions. There was here, indeed, something new, peculiar, and powerful, to which all surrendered themselves, involuntarily and unconsciously. Indifference to national questions and a certain tinge of cosmopolitanism which were inherent in the Russian youth, as well as in the intelligentsia in general, had yielded to patriotic fervor and a unanimous desire to serve their motherland.

The same thing happened, as we know, in other countries. One of the leaders of the German Social-Democrats, Haenisch, who, after the War and revolution became Prussian Minister of Education, in recalling the feelings of cosmopolitans like himself at the outbreak of war, said, "It was as if we had suddenly awakened after a long and confused dream. We opened our eyes and became reconciled to the idea of our German fatherland born out of extreme need and utter danger. And the fatherland, too, became reconciled with us." It was the same in Russia and in other countries, where people whose patriotism had until then lain outside the realm of their consciousness underwent a sudden regeneration. They accepted their country and their country accepted them.

Among the young this transformation manifested itself in the ardent desire to give their forces for the service of their country. A general mobilization of students was not effected until 1916; at the beginning of the War only such students as were reserve officers or privates were called to the army. In addition, there were many who enlisted as volunteers as soon as war was declared. In relation to the great mass of students, this was only a small proportion, but nevertheless it must be mentioned here. According to the Russian law, those who were studying in the universities and technical schools were exempt from military service until they had completed their studies. The law provided, however, for the possible withdrawal of this exemption in case of war. Under the decision of the Council of Ministers of September 30, 1914, sanctioned by the Emperor, and in compliance with article 616 of the Military Statutes, the Minister of War was empowered to call to the army young men who were exempt from military service pending the completion of their studies.

When this decision of the Government was published on October 8

a new wave of enthusiasm spread throughout the universities. It was explained on the following day that the mobilization was not to be carried out at once and would not apply to all students. But according to M. Kleinbort, whom I have already quoted and who speaks from his personal experiences, "there was not a shadow of sorrow or regret" among the young; all had but one desire, that the decision be carried into effect. More than eighteen months passed, however, before the Minister of War made use of his powers. Thus, the great majority of students did not leave their universities on the outbreak of war. All the greater was the zeal shown by them in the various fields in which they were able to help the State. They felt as if they owed a debt to those who were shedding their blood on the battlefields and bearing the main burden of the War.

Even those elements among students whose revolutionary attitude had undergone no change, took their share in the common work. They were loath to assist the State in conducting the War, but they were ready to help its victims. Thus, soon after the beginning of hostilities, a great number of university students were taking part in various organizations created in connection with the War. The largest of these organizations were the Union of Zemstvos and the Union of Towns. These two unions soon developed great activity both at the front and at home, and among the students they found hundreds of spirited, clever, and energetic workers.

The relief of the wounded was naturally the most urgent work of all, and at first it attracted the whole attention of the public and the students. The War took Russia practically unawares; she was unprepared in many respects, including medical services. From the first days on, when the wounded began to arrive from the front, it was discovered that not only was there no room in the hospitals for them, but even no adequate organization for their conveyance from railroad stations to hospitals. A wide field was therefore open to public initiative, and the students played here a very important part. They gave proof not only of a disinterested attachment to the cause, but also of considerable organizing abilities. Some details of their work in this field may be of interest, and the following information refers to Moscow, where the relief of the wounded was particularly well organized. In what follows I shall make use of the special memorandum on this subject drawn up by one of the most active partici-

pators in this work, M. Weber, a former student of the Moscow Technical College.

In the autumn of 1914 the students began to arrive in Moscow earlier than usual. The work of the winter term as a rule begins about the middle of September; yet as early as the latter part of August students, conscious of the exceptional events, began to leave their homes and to gather in Moscow. Some wanted to be nearer the sources of information as to the meaning of events and the happenings at the front, which were causing the greatest anxiety to everyone, old and young. Others wanted some kind of work, in order not to remain passive observers of events in which all were concerned. And they did not have to look long for such work. Every day hospital trains were bringing to Moscow hundreds of wounded soldiers who had to be transported, distributed, and housed. Students put themselves at the disposal of the organizations that were in charge of this relief work. They also formed their own organization, which united students of all the universities and higher technical schools of Moscow and assumed the name of the Moscow Students' Hospital Organization. Its work was coördinated with that of the Moscow municipality. Simultaneously with this, various public institutions, higher technical schools, and wealthy private people began to open hospitals. The transport of the wounded was also organized by means of tramways and automobiles. The work proceeded at full speed. The students formed groups numbering fifty to sixty, which collected information about the hospital trains due to arrive, carried the wounded to the tramways and automobiles, told off those who could walk, and accompanied both the former and the latter to the hospitals. At first, the number of such student groups keeping watch at the railroad stations was only six, but it soon grew to twenty-four.

In addition, there existed a special Students' Tramway Organization of about one hundred and fifty students. Their task was to accompany the wounded in the tramways from the stations to the hospitals. Each student group had fixed hours on duty at the stations and was required to see to the unloading of the train from beginning to end. Each group had its own elected head, the "elder," and was divided into tens; every ten had its own leader and these elected from among themselves a deputy elder. On Sundays there was a meeting of the elders presided over by the chairman of the whole organization. At these general meetings were discussed questions of coördinating

and improving the work of the various student groups. The entire relief of the wounded was directed by the joint committee of all State and public organizations engaged in this work. A delegate of the Students' Hospital Organization took part in the meetings of this committee, which were held every evening and at which the next day's work was discussed. The students' organization also received every evening instructions as to its duties on the next day. The groups of ten were told when and where they had to meet the wounded. The order of reception, registration, and distribution of the wounded was determined, and the whole work was carried on according to a carefully prepared scheme.

Gradually, the technique of this work was improved. Whereas at first the unloading of a train with from seven to eight hundred wounded men required from three to four hours, by Christmas, 1914, it was completed in twenty to thirty minutes. Soon it was found that the ordinary stations did not offer sufficient accommodation for the reception of the wounded, and consequently special receiving points were created, connected with the main terminals by special branch lines. Clearing hospitals were founded near these receiving stations and the wounded walked or were carried there direct from the trains. Thence they were distributed among the Moscow hospitals or evacuated to other towns. The students showed considerable energy and resource in improving the reception and evacuation of the wounded. They threw themselves into this work with great patriotic zeal and with all the ardor of youth. Thanks to its well-planned organization, Moscow was able to receive daily about thirty hospital trains and to reëvacuate about ten of them on the same day.

By November and December, 1914, the development of the Moscow Students' Hospital Organization reached its highest point. At the beginning of 1915 when the All-Russian Unions of Zemstvos and Towns began to organize canteens, building squads, automobile squads, and other similar organizations working near the front, a great many students joined them. Many had already enlisted as volunteers in the army. As a result, the strength of the Students' Hospital Organization diminished in the spring of 1915, and it became necessary to admit into its ranks pupils of secondary schools, who did the less responsible work. The organization continued to exist for about another year, till the spring of 1916, when the compulsory mobilization of students began. By that time, the State and public

bodies in charge of the relief of the wounded, owing to their experience and the improvement of the whole system, were able to do the whole work themselves and to create their own field hospital and canteens, in which a certain number of students of course also participated.

I have described the part played by the students in the relief of the wounded in Moscow, whither the greater number of hospital trains from the front were directed. Similar organizations existed in other places where there was a great influx of wounded men. The students who took part in this work were naturally obliged to abandon their studies to a considerable extent. They could devote to these only the remainder of their time and attention. The number of students, especially of the senior year, engaged in actual study grew less. Yet it cannot be said of the Russian universities that they became quite empty during the War, as was the case in other countries. Their research and academic work proceeded, in spite of the War. Owing to her 150 millions of population, Russia was able for a long time to dispense with the mobilization of her university students. And the number of students who volunteered or devoted themselves entirely to war work, although it grew every year, was nevertheless insignificant in comparison with their total numbers. Every year new large contingents went to the universities from the secondary schools. On the other hand, students who had been wounded in the War or had contracted some chronic disease at the front and were no longer able to serve in the army, were returning to their studies. From 1916 on, the decrease in the number of students became much more considerable, in consequence of the extension of conscription to them, and of other causes to which we shall have occasion to refer in the next chapter. But even then the Russian universities cannot be said to have been quite empty.

How, then, did life in the universities proceed in war-time? I have already pointed out that, generally speaking, the universities and technical schools belong to the most stable type of educational establishments. Scientific analysis and philosophic thought help to maintain balance of mind and wise reserve during the most severe ordeals. Owing to their age-long complex organizations, this spiritual stability is reinforced by the firmness of the outer framework, not easily overthrown. But of course the current of life in them could not but be affected by so exceptional and extraordinary a phenome-

non in modern life as war. Lectures and practical studies went on as usual, and the most popular professors continued to draw the same large audiences. Examinations, intermediate and final, took place at fixed times and according to programs, which differed in no respect from the pre-war program. And yet, although in its essence and in its forms university life was the same as it had always been, it was dominated by the new and potent influence of the War. An observer of the life of the universities of that time, M. Pospelov,[5] pointed out how the general enthusiasm created by the War of necessity drew the universities into its vortex. "From top to bottom," he said,

> from the highest intellectual summits to the hardly civilized popular masses, the whole country is in a state of ferment. Everyone is anxiously waiting for some great cataclysm, which shall bring in its train not only terrible destruction, but also regeneration. At a great historic moment like the present, the pulse of life of public and State institutions and of their individual members is beating in unison with the pulse of the nation; they are carried away by the same uncontrollable force.

The part played by the universities was twofold: their contribution to the general war effort included both the work of scientific thought and practical service. On the one hand, they responded to the general demand for some explanation of the reasons, the aims, and the possible outcome of the War; on the other, they helped to meet the material needs of the moment by organizing assistance to the State in its conduct of the War. Both functions were of such importance in the daily life of the universities that these seemed quite transformed. The research work of the professors and the training of the students still continued, but at the same time new duties were assumed, and to these duties professors and students devoted the greater part of their time, their energy, and their attention. I should like to dwell here on the various manifestations of the work of the universities, in so far as it was connected with the War, and in the first place I propose to refer to the work of thought to which the War gave rise and which found its expression in various lectures and articles on subjects of general interest at that time.

To Russia the War was not a matter of political calculation; it was much more like an enormous tidal wave that swept the whole country, allowing time for neither reflection nor hesitation. The ex-

[5] In *Vestnik Vospitanya* (*Messenger of Education*), August 1915.

traordinary magnitude of the War, which soon acquired not only a European but a world-wide scope, the participation in it of the greatest civilized nations, the exasperation and stubbornness of the conflict—all these pointed to the exceptional character of the struggle that had begun. Many a professor in Russia, as probably in other countries too, began his lectures in the autumn of 1914 with the remark that mankind had entered upon a period of such colossal and overwhelming events as to lead to inevitable changes in the aspect of Europe and of the whole world. Some already spoke of the downfall of European civilization, others looked for a general renaissance. But all felt equally that the problems that faced them were perplexing and ominous. What was the cause of the War? To what would it lead? What did it mean in the life of the nations? Such were the questions that interested everyone. And we may say that Russian thought attached to these questions not only all their theoretical, but also all their moral importance.

Obeying a certain natural desire and inclination to satisfy the eager expectation of the students, many professors devoted their inaugural lectures in the autumn of 1914 to explaining the meaning of the great world drama that was being enacted before their eyes. In some cases, for instance in the lectures on History and International Law, the professors made even more detailed and elaborate references to the problems connected with the War. In the Faculties of Medicine and Natural Science these special lectures assumed a more practical character and were thrown open to outsiders. Such were, for example, the special courses for the training of nurses, also lectures on X-rays, poison gases, etc. The learned societies attached to the universities participated in the organization of these lectures. Thus, the Medical Society of Moscow turned its attention at that time principally to questions of war medicine and to problems of medical assistance to the army. Various technical problems raised by the War engaged the attention of the Chemical and Physical Sections of the Natural Science Society. The Law Society studied the Hague Convention of 1907 and the law relating to prisoners of war. The Economic Society founded in memory of M. Chuprov concentrated its attention on the economic problems connected with the War, such as the high cost of living, and difficulties in the matter of food, fuel, and transport. Even in the Moscow Psychological Society papers

were read purporting to establish a connection between the War and the fundamental religious, philosophic, and scientific principles of European thought. Finally, special lectures for the general public were organized by the professors of the universities and higher technical schools. Some of these lectures were first delivered in Petrograd and Moscow and then repeated in other towns. They dealt partly with historical and political, partly with ethical and philosophical problems. The Russian public was naturally interested in the question of the origin of the War and of the relations between the belligerent Powers; it was no less so in the problem of the war aims, of the destiny of Russia and other Slavonic peoples, and lastly in the fate of European civilization. To all these questions Russian men of learning attempted to give an answer from a scientific and philosophic point of view.

Some German pedagogues, for example, Adolph Hedler,[6] asserted that the German nation had always been warlike, that it had to be so because of its history, and that its schools must correspond to its national character and duties. It is difficult to object to a national education which tries to establish a closer touch between the school and the life of the nation, replied Russian educators, but national culture is only a part of universal culture, and a teacher must grasp this idea. The school must not cultivate in the young an ideal of national isolation and contempt for everything foreign; it must teach them to realize the close bonds that exist between nations and between their cultures, to understand that one nation enriches and complements another. One of Moscow's popular professors, M. Alexis Fortunatov, began his inaugural lecture delivered in several of the higher technical schools of that city in September 1914 with the following rather clumsy, but sincere verses written by himself:

The War is thundering round us,
We cannot shirk our interest in it.
And yet the time must come when for war
Will be substituted unity.
Science will flourish, uniting men,
And Pushkin's words will come true:
"When nations, forgetting their quarrels,
Will be united in one great family."

[6] Adolph Hedler, *Die Deutsche Schule*, 1915, No. 1-2.

Such ideas were characteristic of the Russian thought of that period.

In Russia as in other countries the professors and men of letters in their lectures and articles naturally took great pains to establish the right of their nation to participate in the War, explaining its historically inevitable character and its ideally lawful aims. But they at the same time laid stress on the universal motives of human solidarity and culture. In this respect it is interesting to recall some of the lectures delivered at that time, for they have not lost their value and significance even in our day. Out of the great number of addresses I shall choose those of three Russians whose ideas I should like to restate here: Ilin, Bulgakov, and Lopatin.

M. Ilin, a young Moscow scholar, then Lecturer and later Professor of the University of Moscow, delivered in 1914 two lectures on the spiritual import of war. He accepted war as an appeal that awakens in our hearts the ancient feeling of patriotism and restores the consciousness of common bonds. According to him, the meaning of war lies "in the renovation of life through the acceptance of death for one's country," the war being a spiritual ordeal and at the same time a spiritual judgment. Those who have lived a righteous and spiritual life, who have lived for their country and for things that are worth dying for, pass through that ordeal and are vindicated in that judgment. Those who have lived wrongly, who have pursued personal, selfish, earthly ends, who have lived for things that are not worth dying for, are condemned. War teaches us to be always ready to rise in defense of the supreme values that we put higher than our proper lives. But only that war is just in which the nation is defending its spiritual property—its native land—against some real danger. And in defending our country we must not despise our enemy, nor underrate his cultural achievements. While waging war we must keep on a certain moral level, striving for the supreme victory over our own selves. Thus only can the victory on the battlefield be made secure.

But conceiving war as a heroic renovation of life, M. Ilin sees in it an inner moral contradiction. As an organized form of slaughter which arouses evil feelings in those who take part in it, war is to be regarded as our common guilt. It is not a mere accidental phenomenon, it is a natural product of our life. There are moments in a man's life when his guilty past overwhelms him and imposes on him the

necessity of taking upon himself, openly and consciously, a new guilt, no other course that would be morally justified being left to him. There is an element of true heroism in this acceptance of the consequences of one's wrongdoings, even though it involves a new and heavier guilt. For it implies the possibility of renovation and purification.

This interesting conception of M. Ilin, who understands war as a heroic act coupled with a sin, shows in what a new and profound aspect Russian thinkers envisaged the old problem of war.

The ideas of Professor Bulgakov were just as interesting. This remarkable Russian thinker, who traversed the whole distance that separates enthusiastic Marxism from fervent religious faith and even took holy orders, chose the following subject for a public address: War and the Russian Consciousness. His address shows with particular clearness what Russian philosophers expected from the War in their most far-reaching dreams and forebodings. Here again we come across ideas which afterward, when the terrible ordeals of the War were over, became current in Europe. In Russia those ideas sprang up at the very beginning of the War.

In the opinion of Bulgakov, the War which broke out in 1914 bore witness to a deep crisis affecting an entire degenerate civilization. As Bulgakov puts it, Europe had of late become too much "secularized," too much attached to things material. The "economic man" with his naïve animal egotism and his moral imperturbability stood forth undisguised. Life became outwardly rich and many colored, but its inner sources had dried up. The spirit was yearning and stifling in the clutches of an iron age, raising at times its feeble protesting voice against this oppression. Religion was deprived of its "universal royal mission in all domains of life" and became a mere attribute of everyday existence, one of the outward manifestations of culture. This universal secularization of life resulted in the spiritual impoverishment and impotence which contrasted so strikingly with the growing material wealth and power. It is not easy for one to be constantly tempted by wealth without upsetting one's spiritual balance. Secularization and the pursuit of material comfort are dangers that threaten every highly civilized country suffering from hyper-culture. At present, said Professor Bulgakov, a great fire has overtaken the bourgeois culture and it is not an accident that this fire has been set ablaze in Germany, which is the most

bourgeois among the European nations. She has imbued even Christianity with the bourgeois spirit by singling out and emphasizing in it primarily the elements of worldly, practical everyday morality. The War is destroying with relentless strokes the roofs of the cozy cottages in which mankind has housed itself, leaving it again under the unfathomable dome of Heaven. Europe is still spiritually alive, the bourgeois spirit has proved to be a disease which her vital organs have escaped. Such are the glad tidings brought by the War. Where at times we seemed to see a spiritual graveyard, a realm of comfort and material civilization, of disbelief and speculation, a flame has sprung up reducing to ashes many things that deserved to be burnt down. Ancient valor has somehow reawakened all over Europe, to her surprise.

From another point of view, but with the same deep insight into the meaning of events, this problem of the spiritual meaning of the War was examined by M. Lopatin, the well-known professor of philosophy in the University of Moscow, in his remarkable speech at the annual meeting of the University on January 12, 1917. By then the destructive effects of the War were making themselves more felt, and the serious outlook for the future was more discernible. Like Bulgakov, Professor Lopatin saw in the European War the downfall of European civilization. "Whatever may be the outward results of the great War, its inward meaning is already revealed: it is a great collapse of European culture." According to Lopatin, a complete change in the mental outlook of modern man must be the inevitable result of such a war. "We all were really convinced that we stood at the happy close of a historical process, that we had to take but a few steps in order to see the radiant kingdom of Truth, Reason, Freedom, Peace and quiet universal Happiness established forever." "Is it possible to maintain this now?" asks Professor Lopatin. "Is mankind ready for the earthly Paradise?" Satisfied that the answer to that question must inevitably be in the negative, Professor Lopatin believes that there are for modern man only two ways out: either complete extinction of spirit, or a drastic change in his outlook upon the world. Analyzing in detail this modern outlook, Lopatin sees its main shortcoming in its "geocentrism," in the concentration of all interests upon the earthly things that surround us. A new path must be traced out and a new truth discovered. The dream of a terrestrial paradise which man was to create by his power and his science is los-

ing its brightness and fading away. But since the Near and the Transitory have deceived us, we must seek the Distant and the Enduring: "In order not to lose courage when darkness surrounds us and the future is black, we must firmly believe that there is no such gloom as will not be dispersed by the rays of Eternal Light." Modern man will be saved from the terrible catastrophe that threatens him now, by combining the demands of Reason with the great principles of Gospels.

For a long time a critical view of European civilization had been developing among Russian thinkers. It originated in the 'thirties of the nineteenth century and formed one of the peculiar features of the so-called Slavophil school. The great European War which had set the whole world ablaze seemed to confirm this old Slavophil notion. It is natural that the Russian scholars who were the first to foresee the coming catastrophe were also the first to give a clear expression to their forebodings.

But the war work of the Russian university teachers was not confined to the solution of theoretical problems. They also took a direct part in alleviating the sufferings of victims of war and assisted the State in the difficult tasks that the War imposed on it. Amongst these the principal place must be assigned to the relief of the wounded soldiers. I have described above the activities of the students' organizations in receiving and distributing the wounded. That work was carried on outside the universities under the auspices of various public institutions and for that reason we spoke of it elsewhere. But the universities as such did not hold aloof from this common war work. As I have already mentioned, the proper distribution of the wounded was facilitated by the fact that numerous new hospitals were being opened by the universities. Those universities which had their own medical schools offered their clinics, with their existing equipment, for the use of the wounded and sick soldiers. Those which had no medical schools of their own, arranged parts of their premises as hospitals, or collected funds for founding such hospitals elsewhere. In some instances university hospitals were organized at the front. Since, as a rule, the equipment of every new hospital required both a large outlay of money and a numerous personnel, doctors, assistants, nurses, etc., and individual schools could not afford the expenditure involved, it was customary for several schools to form an association or join some other body or institution.

Thus, in Petrograd a hospital for sick and wounded soldiers was founded by the association of all the universities and technical colleges of that city. The idea of such an association originated among the professors of the Petrograd Medical Institute for Women. Its Board approved the suggestion of a special field hospital which owing to its proximity to the theater of war would be able to receive the wounded practically on the spot. The teaching staff of other Petrograd universities and technical colleges warmly supported the idea and it was decided to raise the necessary funds by means of monthly deductions from the salaries. Thanks to the great number (about thirty) of universities and technical schools in Petrograd, a considerable sum of money was collected by October, 1914, permitting the equipment of a hospital of from 150 to 200 beds. This hospital was attached to the Elisabeth Nursing Corporation of the Red Cross, and as early as October 8 it left for Warsaw with Dr. Kryzhanovsky as the Chief Medical Officer. During the stubborn November battles in Poland it did a good deal of work in Lodz. It was soon found necessary to extend the hospital to 400 beds, that is, twice as many as were originally planned for. Accordingly, the work of the original personnel was nearly doubled. Later on, the position of the hospital became still more difficult. When the Russian troops had to evacuate Lodz, it was impossible to leave to their fate the patients suffering from severe wounds or infectious diseases. Being the best-equipped field hospital, it had to stay behind and undertake the responsible task of relieving the sick and wounded soldiers in a starving town occupied by the enemy. In December and January the number of beds reached 600. The services rendered by it were very great, but the expense was also very considerable, and in addition to the monthly deductions from their salaries the Petrograd professors decided to publish a collection of essays on the problems of the World War, devoting the proceeds to the maintenance of their field hospital. That voluminous work of 688 pages contained some extremely interesting articles written by all the eminent scholars of Petrograd. It met with no little success at the time.

The work of the Moscow universities followed a different course. In view of the great influx of the wounded into Moscow at the very beginning of the War, these universities came to the assistance of the existing institutions by organizing their own hospitals. The percentage deductions from the professors' salaries naturally did not

suffice for the organization and upkeep of large hospitals. Accordingly the various colleges entered into agreements with different public organizations possessing large pecuniary means, such as the Moscow Municipality, the Joint Committee of the Moscow Merchants and Stockbrokers Associations, etc. With the money thus received the universities and higher technical schools opened hospitals, to which they gave their constant care and in which their members did much active work. The Commercial Institute of Moscow adopted a similar plan. The Moscow University had its own medical schools rich in scientific forces. It also possessed its own large and well-organized clinics, maintained at the expense of the State. It therefore found it easier to organize at the very beginning of the War its own hospital for sick and wounded soldiers. It had only to adapt for this purpose various university clinics. The admission of ordinary patients was not stopped, but sick and wounded soldiers were admitted in far greater numbers. Thus, in 1915, in the Propaedeutic Clinic of the University of Moscow there were 94 civil and 364 military patients, in the Therapeutic Clinic of the Medical Schools 133 civil and 737 military patients, and so on. Moreover, all the numerous clinics of the University of Moscow occupied by the sick and wounded soldiers were now kept open throughout the year, whereas in peace-time they usually were closed during the summer vacation.

And finally, hospitals were opened on other premises belonging to the University. They were maintained by voluntary contributions, primarily from the teaching staff of the university itself. Some of the wealthier professors, such as the well-known gynecologist, Professor Sneguirev, contributed large sums toward the upkeep of these hospitals. Members of the faculties and their families, as well as other groups, gave their aid in these clinics and hospitals. Thus, in the hospital situated in Professor Muratov's clinic for nervous diseases nearly all the work was performed by the members of the company of the Moscow Art Theater, so famous now both in Europe and in America. Of course, some of the professors of the medical schools in Moscow University and other universities, and especially surgeons, went to the front in order to work in the immediate vicinity of the fighting zone. In the organization of hospitals students did not lag behind their professors; in Moscow alone, several hospitals were operated by students, who were financially assisted for the purpose by various public bodies.

Sometimes, when the need proved very urgent, university premises had suddenly to be transformed into hospitals. Thus in Moscow the People's Shanyavsky University was on August 23, 1914, quickly converted into an improvised hospital. The influx of wounded on that day was especially great, and the space available in the existing hospitals was insufficient. It was therefore promptly decided to use for the reception of wounded soldiers a part of the large and beautiful building of the People's University. In an hour's time the necessary measures were taken to enable the university to receive a considerable number of wounded soldiers. Hot meals were waiting for them on their arrival, and they immediately received the medical aid they needed. Later on the majority of these wounded were distributed among the properly equipped hospitals, and the premises of the People's University were vacated in order to enable the lectures to go on; only a small portion continued to be occupied as a hospital. The readiness of the University administration to relieve the acute need proved at the time of great assistance. Similar services were rendered by other schools.

But the participation of the universities in war was not confined to the relief of wounded soldiers. The needs of the army and of the victims of the War were manifold, and great was the general desire to help those who had to bear the main burden of the struggle. University professors and students, like other social circles, showed by all available means their sympathy with the army. Women students in the coeducational colleges and universities formed groups of nurses and made shirts and bandages for the soldiers. In other colleges special library commissions were created; they founded and looked after libraries in hospitals and hospital trains. Special committees for arranging entertainment for the wounded were also one of the features. Toward the Christmas and the Easter holidays collections for the purpose of sending gifts to the army were organized in the universities. Sometimes students themselves accompanied these gifts to their destination. In some cases various universities acted separately; sometimes they united for joint action. In Petrograd, for instance, there existed a joint committee of students of several universities and technical schools which looked after the dispatch of books and other donations to the front. Students also took a prominent part in various street collections which were frequently organized during the War for the benefit of soldiers in the Russian and Allied armies.

When in the middle of 1915 the influx of refugees to the inland provinces began to increase rapidly, students shared actively in the work of relieving them. They also helped in the foundation of orphans' homes for the children of those who fell in the War. Such a home was founded with their help in the docks in Petrograd. In all work of this kind the organizing and directing part was played by the professors. The work of Russians properly so called in this field was shared by other national groups of students, such as Georgians, Armenians, etc. They either joined general Russian organizations, or formed independent groups to help their own countrymen. In Moscow, for example, Georgian students had representatives of their group regularly to attend those wounded Georgians who were not familiar with the Russian language; they read newspapers to them, wrote letters, and drew up lists of the wounded to be published in the local Georgian press.

If from this kind of work performed by students and professors and representing rather their personal efforts, we turn now to the collective work done in various scientific institutions, laboratories, etc., we shall here also meet with a considerable variety. In the autumn of 1915 the Ministry of Commerce and Industry issued a long memorandum on the war work done by the technical schools under its authority. That work was extraordinarily varied. Thus, in the Kiev Polytechnic Institute experiments on a large scale were carried out by Professor Kashchenko on the cultivation of medical herbs which had hitherto been obtained exclusively from Germany. Aspirin, novocaine, utropin, and other drugs were manufactured in the chemical laboratories of the Institute. In the Don Polytechnic Institute carbolic acid, collodion, and chloroform were manufactured. In the Mining Institute of Ekaterinoslav, Professor Pissarzhevsky organized a special laboratory for the preparation of iodine from the seaweed of the Black Sea, which proved to be richer in this element than that of the Atlantic Ocean. The Moscow Commercial Institute was occupied in manufacturing dyes which used to come from Germany. Its X-ray laboratory, which was used by thirty-three Moscow hospitals, was also of much service to wounded soldiers. Still more important was the work performed by various workshops. In those of the Polytechnic Institute in Petrograd necessary changes were introduced to meet the needs of the flying corps and in connection therewith special instruction was organized for aviators and

mechanics. In the engineering workshop of the Polytechnic Institute of Kiev various parts of machinery and instruments were manufactured. During the first eleven months of the War, the workshop, working daily from seven o'clock in the morning to midnight, turned out over five hundred machines. Very considerable and successful was the work of certain schools in the electro-technical field, in the manufacture and repair of field telephones and signaling devices.

Such was the work of the higher technical schools of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. But the universities also did as much as they could. In the University of Moscow some very good work was done by the Gabrichevsky Bacteriological Institute, which organized on a large scale the production of anti-tetanus serum, as well as of smallpox, cholera, and typhus vaccines. Mme. Tsiklensky, a member of that Institute, went to the front in order to organize bacteriological laboratories there. The Institute maintained a close contact with the All-Russian Unions of Zemstvos and Towns and supplied their needs. In the University of Kharkov Professor Trinkler organized the production of Russian catgut. Under the direction of other professors several workshops were organized in Kharkov to manufacture apparatus required for the equipment of clinics and hospitals. The production of workshops comprised thermostats, sterilizing apparatus, operating tables, bathtubs of various kinds, tools for making artificial limbs, etc. The Veterinary Institute of Kharkov experimented in the cultivation of the principal medical herbs in its Botanical Gardens.

In certain cases the universities, not possessing sufficient means or adequate workshops to manufacture on their own account the articles that were most needed at the moment, discussed and took measures for the development and improvement of the corresponding branches of industry in their region. Thus in the University of Kazan Professor Vyssotsky put forward the suggestion that the universities should concentrate their efforts on the mobilization of the industries which could satisfy the demand for surgical and scientific instruments, etc. The proposal came before the School of Medicine of the University on February 2, 1915, and it was decided to set up a special committee to investigate it thoroughly. Professor Vyssotsky was elected Chairman of the committee. As early as March 1915, it was in possession of valuable information, mainly referring to the Volga-Kama region, concerning the factories and workshops manufactur-

ing surgical instruments, glass for chemical, microscopic, and museum work, chemical apparatus, implements for disinfection, medicines, medical soaps, etc. In order to improve the output of Russian industry in connection with the War the following steps were recommended by the Committee:

(1) that the competent authorities be urged to include in the program of industrial, professional, and other similar schools, at least in the Kazan educational district, such theoretical and practical instruction as was necessary for the training of skilled workers in the production of scientific and pedagogic articles;

(2) that the Curator of the educational district of Kazan be requested to consider the foundation of a permanent exhibition, attached to the Pedagogic Museum of the said district, of articles produced in the Volga-Kama region which could be used for scientific and educational purposes, to which might eventually be added similar articles produced in other parts of Russia;

(3) that application be made for the enlargement and adaptation of the engineering workshop of the University of Kazan so as to enable it to supply the needs not only of the School of Natural Science, but also of the School of Medicine;

(4) that one of the fellows of the Medical School be sent, during the summer vacation, to investigate the factories and workshops of the Volga-Kama region producing articles that could be used for scientific and medical purposes.

We see, then, that the School of Medicine of the University of Kazan undertook the important task of stimulating the manufacture of scientific and medical apparatus. Before the War Russia had in this respect been entirely dependent upon Germany, and as a consequence when war broke out the shortage of these articles was particularly felt all over the country. Some of the measures recommended by Professor Vyssotsky, such as the foundation of an illustrative exhibition, were meant to be retained even after the War was over. But in any case his suggestions and the contact that was henceforth established between the University and industrial undertakings might have been of great moment if Russia's withdrawal from the War and the Revolution of 1917 had not interrupted the work of his committee. Of more lasting importance was another committee set up by the University of Kazan, for the replacement of foreign

medical herbs by home-grown herbs. The work of this committee continued under the Soviet Government.

Finally, when it happened that the students wished to associate with their war work persons who did not belong to the university, they acted through the intermediary of the university societies. For, as a rule, experts and amateurs in a given branch of knowledge might join those societies whether they were members of the university or not. In this respect the work of the Chemical and Physical Society of the University of Kiev, a detailed account of which was published in the Record of that University for August 1915, deserves special mention. The Chemical and Physical Society of Kiev turned its attention in the first place to the acute shortage of drugs. This shortage, as has already been mentioned, was causing anxiety to other scientific institutions. The Kiev Society organized the enlarged manufacture of certain drugs and supplied them to the hospitals. The production of chloroform was carried on on a large scale. Further, in view of the need for dry galvanic batteries which was experienced in the army, a special committee was formed to deal with their manufacture. The Society also succeeded in meeting the requirements of aviation, which was suffering from a shortage of properly refined petrol. It also took part in the organization of X-ray laboratories, and one of its members achieved very satisfactory results in producing magnifying screens. A great effort was made in the matter of X-ray research. Under the direction of Professor Kossonogov, of the University of Kiev, a special committee composed of teachers in technical schools and universities, was formed to investigate the question of the use of X-rays in cases of wounds. The committee was reinforced by all the members of the Chemical and Physical Society who worked on this subject, as well as by many students. The necessary instruments were lent to the committee by the physical laboratories of the technical schools and universities. This enabled it to set up X-ray laboratories in ten hospitals in Kiev. The members of the Committee, moreover, worked in the X-ray laboratory of the Kiev Military Hospital. By August 1915 over one thousand investigations of the more complicated wounds had been made in these laboratories.

I have given here only a few instances of the war work carried on by the universities and technical colleges, without exhausting all the available facts. My object has been merely to show that in the first

year of the War university professors and students were already working hard to satisfy the needs that had arisen; some were assisting the wounded, others were conducting scientific and technical research and manufacturing scientific instruments, or acting as advisers and experts on various industrial and technical questions. The variety of the work is shown by the examples that I have given. It resulted in valuable technical improvements in the methods of research and production previously known; it also enriched Russian industry by enabling it to produce articles whose manufacture had in the past been hindered by the competition of cheaper German goods.

In the second year of the War, after the heavy defeats suffered by the Russian army in Galicia and Poland, work of this kind increased considerably and to some extent assumed a new character. The impression produced on Russian public opinion by these military reverses was intense. The press and public bodies accused the Government and especially the War Ministry, of failing to undertake in time the measures necessary to place the Russian army on an equal footing with a strong and well-armed enemy, by providing it with adequate supplies of arms and ammunition. Public organizations showed an ardent desire to participate in meeting the needs of the army. This general enthusiasm was shared by the universities. The heavy blows sustained by Russia in the spring of 1915 did not crush public energy; on the contrary, they stimulated it to fresh efforts. Russia, till then so powerful and so conscious of her own power, suddenly became aware of the danger of defeat and of heavy national losses.

We have some striking documents recording the impression that these unfortunate events produced upon Russian university circles. On September 5, 1915, took place the first meeting of the Council of the University of Moscow. It was a significant incident in the life of that university. The meeting was opened by the Rector, Professor Lyubavsky, Professor of Russian History, whose address contained these words:

Russia is faced with the danger of forfeiting the heritage left to her by Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and even Alexis Mikhailovich. She is in peril of being thrown back three hundred years. It is the duty of the oldest Russian university to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the present war is not an accidental conflict, the outcome of some regrettable misunderstanding, but a life and death

struggle. Any lack of energy and unity may involve both Russia and her allies in the direst consequences.

The Rector's address was listened to with great attention, and the following motion proposed by him was adopted by the University Council:

(1) the Council of Moscow University believes that the future of Russia depends on the issue of the War with Germany;

(2) consequently, and in accord with the views of the Duma and the State Council, as well as of the whole Russian people, the Council is of opinion that the struggle must be carried on to the end and that all the material and spiritual forces of the nation must be exerted to repel the deadly enemy of Russia and her allies;

(3) desiring to serve, to the utmost of its ability, the cause of national defense, the University Council offers the collaboration of all its available scientific resources and laboratories to governmental and other public institutions connected with work for that cause, and earnestly calls upon all students to assist the cause to the utmost of their ability and strength;

(4) in order to realize these objects without delay, the Council has decided to elect a special commission of its members and to address a request to the War Industries Committee and technical committees that they shall admit members of this commission, at the same time authorizing the latter to offer their practical collaboration to the committees.

A few days later, on September 22, a meeting of professors and students was held in the Moscow Technical College in connection with the same military reverses, to discuss the questions that arose out of the suggested technical mobilization of students of that college. Nearly all the students, over one thousand of them, attended the meeting. The two largest lecture halls of the college were crowded. Great enthusiasm and excitement reigned among the students. A special committee of students, which had previously examined the question, reported to the general meeting, recommending that students should do all they could to meet the needs of national defense and explaining how this could be achieved. Then the Director of the College, Professor Grinevetsky, delivered a long address pointing out that some of the students might be employed as mechanics and foremen in factories. One of the lecturers of the College, M. Yassinsky, recently returned from Germany, where he had been interned on the outbreak of war, gave his impressions of the mobilization of

the students in Germany, where the majority had been called to the army, while those who stayed behind were working hard in various technical organizations. After discussion, the following resolution was adopted:

> The students of the Imperial Technical College assembled in general meeting, express the ardent desire to lend their forces to the cause of national defense, and instruct the committee of students working in factories and elected by a general meeting comprising the representatives of the faculty and of public organizations, to devise the most appropriate methods of utilizing all the technical forces of the college, and to call a further general meeting in the near future.

Similar meetings were held and similar motions passed in other technical and commercial schools. Some of these meetings took place as early as the summer. Thus, in the Moscow Commercial Institute a meeting called by the Director of the Institute and attended by the professors and lecturers was held on July 3, in spite of the fact that it was vacation. The questions discussed were the same: How could professors and students help their country in her hour of trial? What practical and technical work could they do to relieve the acute needs of the moment?

Since the Russian army suffered not from any lack of man-power, but from lack of technical preparation and from shortage of munitions, all thoughts were now concentrated upon these points; and from the autumn of 1915 on, the work of the Russian universities was directed accordingly. In all universities and technical colleges special committees were set up to discuss and carry out the measures considered necessary. From the above-quoted resolutions of the University and Technical College of Moscow, an idea can be formed of the task entrusted to such committees. They had to consider how students and professors could best be employed in view of the technical requirements of war-time, and to establish contact with the corresponding military-technical organizations. The committee created for this purpose by the University of Moscow was significantly called the "War Committee." Such was the spirit and trend of the time, that the supreme and most ancient nursery of theoretical knowledge in Russia—the University of Moscow—set up a "War Committee"!

Whereas in the first year of the War the war work of the univer-

sities was principally directed to the relief of sick and wounded soldiers and to the production of scientific and pedagogic articles, in the second year it became concentrated on the manufacture of munitions of various kinds. The universities and technical colleges became associated with the work of the war industries committees and other similar organizations.

If we consider the work performed during this period by various bodies of the University of Moscow, we shall see that from the autumn of 1915 on several institutes and laboratories were engaged exclusively on war work. This kind of work was being done by the laboratories of Professor Shpitalsky, Professor Chelintsev, Professor Kablukov, Professor Nastyukov, as well as by the laboratories of the Physical, Engineering, and Agricultural Institutes. Even the laboratory of the Psychological Institute was adapted to war needs. These laboratories were engaged, on the one hand, in research and expert advice for the War Ministry and various public bodies, and on the other hand in the manufacture of articles necessary for the defense of the country. Thus, the laboratory of Professor Chelintsev was mainly engaged in work upon explosives and hand-grenades not containing white phosphorus. Professor Shpitalsky's laboratory also dealt with explosives, as well as with torpedo mines, galvanic devices for the manufacture of munitions (a time-saving method of galvanizing the steel parts of shells), and the manufacture of rockets and all sorts of war signals; it also conducted researches into the methods of counteracting poison gas. Research relating to poison gas was also carried on by the laboratory of Professor Kablukov, which in addition was engaged in various investigations with regard to chemical war industry. Professor Nastyukov's laboratory was engaged in producing khaki dye, as well as other dyes of which great need was felt in Russia. The Physical Institute manufactured shells and various instruments, especially gauges. Gauges were also produced by the laboratory of the Psychological Institute, where students of various schools were engaged on this work. In the mechanical laboratory of Professor Zhukovsky, who had previously studied the problems of aeronautics and had acquired a great reputation in this field, were produced articles required for aviation. The Agricultural Institute, besides giving its opinion on the products that were sent to it by the Ministry of War, also did chemical work in connection with war requirements. All these institutions were in constant

touch with the Ministry of War, with the war industries committees, and with other public bodies. Like the university clinics which were handed over for the use of the sick and wounded soldiers, these laboratories and institutes continued their war work throughout the whole year without the ordinary interruption for the vacation period. Those who worked in them were also doing instructional work in the army and at home.

This survey of the work of the various institutions of the University of Moscow shows to what an extent the higher educational bodies were at that time contributing to meet the needs of war. The conditions of the moment reflected themselves even upon the lectures, in the program of which were included special courses on technical subjects connected with the War. In the autumn of 1915 the following courses were announced at the Faculty of Science of the University of Moscow: Professor Chelintsev on explosives, Professor Zhukovsky on aviation, and Professor Speransky on war meteorology. Other schools, of course, followed the lead of the University. The Technical College in Moscow, which had excellent mechanical laboratories and its own mechanical workshop, organized the production of munitions and gauges on a large scale. The ardent speeches delivered at the general meeting on September 22 left their trace. Both professors and students set to work with great energy. The manufacture of munitions was so well organized both from the technical and from the economic point of view as to serve as a model. Equally well organized was the manufacture of molds and calibrating instruments. The shortage of pyrometers, which are indispensable for indicating the temperature during the tempering of steel, led the Technical College to start the manufacture of special Russian optical pyrometers, on the Arbatsky system. These pyrometers were sent to all factories that were in need of them.

But beyond producing munitions and other articles required for the purposes of the War, the College was also training instructors in various branches of war industry. The prospective instructors had to pass through a complicated course of theoretical and practical tuition, after which they were subjected to a test and the most capable of them were dispatched to appropriate factories and workshops. The number of instructors trained by the Technical College exceeded three hundred. The aerodynamic laboratory of Professor Zhukovsky contributed largely to the development of military flying

and to the training of aviators. Even the Commercial Institute of Moscow, whose financial and technical resources were relatively small, organized its own excellent workshop for the manufacture of calibrating instruments requiring the greatest accuracy. It also organized analytical research into anti-gas remedies, at the same time manufacturing gas masks on a large scale. Its work in this respect was so successful, both technically and scientifically, that it attracted general attention. In this domain also Moscow offered an example to other university centers. All over Russia there was similar activity; together with other bodies and undertakings, the universities set to work to satisfy urgent war needs. Some schools, such as the Polytechnic Institute of Kiev, repaired automobiles and airplanes and started the manufacture of propellers; others, for instance the University of Odessa, under the direction of Professors Orlov and Bilimovich and with the help of a gifted self-instructed mechanician named Timchenko, manufactured new and improved instruments for war purposes, such as a device for the rapid production of cartridges.

Finally, there were schools which conducted research into explosives, poison gases, etc., and manufactured signal rockets, and so on. Sometimes this work led to unfortunate accidents, for example in the University of Odessa a young chemist, Shtwan, died of poisoning while studying the effects of poison gases. In all the universities and technical schools the professors organized either research work or production in their institutes, laboratories, and workshops, or acted as advisers in various technical and industrial war organizations, or again organized production in munitions factories, in which latter task they were naturally assisted by the students. Sometimes this work necessitated long journeys. Thus a group of students of the Petrograd Mining Institute was sent to the Urals, to the works of Perm and Zlatoust, in order to receive instruction in the manufacture of munitions. Even such purely scientific institutions as the Russian Academy of Sciences in Petrograd and the Scientific Institute in Moscow shared in this general patriotic movement. The chemical laboratory of the Academy of Sciences, as well as its Geological and Mineralogical Museums, adapted their own workshops to meet war needs; the central Physical Observatory, known as the Nicholas Observatory, attached to the Academy, did some important

work in the field of aviation and war meteorology. Among other things it adapted, with funds provided by the Ministry of War, its own workshop to the manufacture of meteorological instruments required for war purposes. The resources of the Moscow Scientific Institute, founded not long before the War, were insufficient to allow it to organize any work on a large scale, but it took its share in the general movement by equipping a mobile X-ray laboratory and manufacturing maximum thermometers.

It would, however, be wrong to suppose that, owing to this close participation in war work, Russian universities and technical colleges were during the War turned into mere technical undertakings, or that all students and professors abandoned their studies and took to this new occupation. We must bear in mind the great number of students, especially in Petrograd and Moscow, of whom a considerable proportion still continued to attend lectures. Some of them shared in the national movement by taking part in the numerous collections of money and clothing for the army and for sick and wounded soldiers, or by sitting on various committees which sprang up in connection with the War, a kind of work that did not encroach too much upon the students' time. Others, for reasons of their own, stood aloof from this general current; sometimes they simply did not or could not find any scope for their energies. For many students, for instance in the Schools of Law, History, or even Mathematics, it was not always easy to find a war occupation. Those of them who had energy and organizing ability were the first to find work, and as there were always enough of such students, supply usually exceeded demand. During the War one often heard students complaining of the impossibility of satisfying their desire to work for the common cause. Even in the technical schools, which did by far the greater part of the war work, not all the students were engaged thereon. In the universities, the proportion of students remaining unoccupied was of course still larger. Those who took up war work, both professors and students, usually gave themselves up entirely to it; often they took a more or less prolonged leave and went to the front. The rest continued to read for their examinations and to attend lectures. Thus, there was practically no change in the outward aspect of academic life. In order to realize the profound change in the essential character of that life, with its new burden of

grave anxieties and care, it would have been necessary to penetrate into the souls of the professors and students and to make a careful inspection of the institutes and laboratories, where chemical experiments and mechanical work were proceeding accompanied by the din of machinery. It was only the Revolution, as we shall see below, which in 1917 wrought complete devastation in the universities, and even caused them to close for a long period. Until then, in spite of all the hardships occasioned by the War, the universities continued their normal work.

We have described above the influence of the heavy military reverses suffered by Russia in 1915 on the general trend of life and the mentality of the universities. In the autumn of 1915, when professors and students returned to their work at the beginning of the term, they had to confront new problems and new anxieties in connection with the shortage of munitions and various technical requisites that had become apparent in the Russian army. During the same autumn the protraction of the War led to further trouble: a general shortage of fuel and food. Owing to her natural wealth, Russia during the first months of the War was hardly conscious either of this shortage or of the rise of prices caused by it. Both the shortage and the rise of prices began to be felt only toward the end of the first year of hostilities, and by the end of the summer of 1915 they stood clearly revealed to the eyes of the Government and of the public. The press began to utter warnings of imminent difficulties in the supply of food and fuel to the population. The situation was being freely discussed by public bodies; the latter, fully aware that such difficulties were inevitable in war, persistently pointed out the necessity of organizing some sort of State control of the supply of food and fuel.

In August 1915, when that necessity was fully realized by the Government and the public, Special Councils for Food and Fuel Supply were created by Imperial ukase. As the dislocation of transport caused by the War also called for urgent measures and regulation, a Special Council for Transport was created. In order to coordinate all the work for the defense of the country, a Special Council for National Defense was also formed. To these Councils and to their local organs were granted such extraordinary powers, as wartime conditions required. I shall not here discuss the organization

and functions of these Councils, since they fall outside my subject.[7] But I am directly concerned with the participation of college professors and students in their activities. This will complete the picture of the work of the universities in the various new fields that were opened to them by the War.

Of the above-mentioned four Special Councils, we are interested in only the first two, those dealing with food and fuel. The other two Councils, concerned with transport and defense, included chiefly experts in those respective fields. But the Food and Fuel Councils, owing to the very character of their work required the services of men familiar not only with the practice but also with the theory of the subject. In order to regulate and prescribe, to direct and rationalize certain sides of economic life, it was in the first place necessary to study the problem closely, to get accurate facts and figures, to possess scientific knowledge and technical information. It was also necessary to undertake a careful, systematic, and continual tabulation of the facts and figures available. It was precisely in this that professors and students could be of great help to the newly created bodies. And, indeed, we find that the central organs of those Councils in Petrograd and their local branches actually did invite university professors to take part in the organization of their work and that students assisted them. The latter had sometimes to perform hard manual labor, but they all gave proof of their unwavering enthusiasm.

When the first repercussions of the military crisis began to be felt not only at the front, but also in the interior of the country, everybody went on repeating that it was necessary to preserve tranquillity and order, no matter how far from the theater of war. Whereas at the beginning of the War this was simply accepted as an axiomatic proposition, now people began to draw practical conclusions from that axiom by organizing their economic activity. And here we see how the universities helped the State in this important task. In Petrograd and in Moscow, in Kharkov and in Kiev, we find a great number of professors and students offering their services in this cause. The most characteristic in this respect was, perhaps, the work of the Moscow Fuel Council, at the head of which was placed a pro-

[7] *See* P. P. Gronsky, *The Effects of the War upon the Central Government of Russia,* in the volume, *The War and the Russian Government,* in this series of *The Economic and Social History of the World War.*

fessor, the author of this essay. Two experts, Professors Hensel and Kirsch, were invited to take charge of the two main sections of the Council, the Economic Section and the Technical Section. A special Statistical Section was placed under the direction of a young economist, M. Kafengaus. Several professors—economists and technical advisers—took part in the meetings which were held periodically. Young lecturers and students of various technical schools of Moscow formed the bulk of the Council, so that it became a kind of appendage or committee of the Moscow University and technical schools. The Moscow Fuel Council set to work immediately and with great energy.

While the professors who stood at the head of the Moscow Fuel Council and the experts whose services they had enlisted were drawing up the general plan of work and the measures to be taken immediately, the students did some hard and urgent work on the Moscow railways. It appeared that at several of the Moscow terminals there was a great congestion of trucks which could not be unloaded owing to the quantity of goods arriving and the scarcity of labor. Many of these trucks were loaded with firewood. At that time, September 1915, Moscow was already feeling the approach of cold autumn weather, and there were bitter complaints of the impossibility of buying firewood. Wood-merchants' stores were empty, while the railway stations were encumbered with trucks containing wood. Consumers themselves had to go to the stations, which was not easy owing to the remoteness of the Moscow terminals from the central parts of the town, and buy, unload, and carry home the fuel which in cold weather is indispensable in Moscow. The difficulty was increased by the fact that, in view of the fixed prices established in Moscow, wood-merchants preferred to sell their commodity at the railroad stations where they could escape the control of the authorities charged with the enforcement of the fixed prices in the city, there being no special inspectors at the stations. It was easy to remedy this by abolishing the fixed price for wood. This was done and, under the special conditions then prevailing in Russia, the abolition proved beneficial, but its effects became apparent only after a few weeks. And here it was that the students offered their help in unloading the trucks. The work was soon in full swing, and the extreme congestion of the Moscow railway stations, which had hitherto prevented the arrival of further supplies of wood, came rapidly to an end.

Later on, when this emergency had been more or less overcome, the

students, in their capacity of representatives of the Moscow Fuel Council, did another piece of work at the railroad stations requiring great care and diligence; they made up daily, according to the railway documents, a complete list of trucks with fuel arriving in Moscow, thus enabling the Fuel Council always to know exactly the state of fuel supply in the city. Students also acted as salesmen in special stores opened by the Moscow municipality with the object of selling wood at reduced prices to the poorest of the population. This again was not an easy matter, for one had to work in unheated premises in bitter cold which sometimes continued for weeks. Many students were also attached to the special delivery service of the Moscow Fuel Council, whose duty it was to deliver fuel to various Moscow institutions. Students saw to the accuracy and punctuality of the delivery. Finally, as has already been said, they filled many posts in all the sections of the Council. They proved intelligent and assiduous workers, being of great assistance to the Council in carrying out the responsible task entrusted to it by the Government.

In Petrograd, in the central offices of the Special Council for Fuel, a prominent part was also played by the professors of the Polytechnic Institute, among them Professor Lomshakov and Professor Dehn should be specially mentioned. A similarly prominent part was played in the Special Council for Food Supply by Professor Peter Struve, the well-known economist, who was assisted by several of his pupils, students and former students of the Polytechnic Institute of Petrograd. In Kharkov some very important work was done by Professor Timofeev, who presided over a special committee for the regulation of coal prices. Generally speaking, the important part played in these Councils by members of Russian universities and technical colleges and the work that was done by them can be fully realized only if the activities of these bodies are described in greater detail. We must confine ourselves here to stating that the participation of men of learning in the work of the Special Councils for Food Supply and Fuel introduced into that work, wherever it took place, methods of scientific research and of scientific treatment of the available data. Owing to their participation this work assumed the character of scientific accuracy which is an indispensable condition of sound and well-planned economic policy. This was particularly important and indeed vital in those times of serious and often inextricable difficulties.

Speaking of the economic problems of that period, we must mention here that besides participating in the Special Councils for Food Supply and Fuel and in various committees created by war industries committees and local government bodies, university professors sometimes themselves set up special committees and undertook various kinds of work in order to meet the growing difficulties of the time. As an example, I will mention an economic committee formed in the autumn of 1915 in the Moscow Commercial Institute. The aims of that committee were thus described by one of its promoters, M. Anisimov, Lecturer at the Commercial Institute:[8]

It is becoming evident that non-government bodies taking part in the supply of the army at times encounter great obstacles, due to their lack of familiarity with the conditions prevailing at present in various branches of trade and industry, and the want of some competent body that might at any moment inform them of the current changes in the commercial and industrial situation. The need of such a source of information was so urgent that it was proposed at a meeting of the Joint Committee of Unions of Zemstvos and Towns and other organizations to create a special information bureau. But this function could be just as successfully discharged by the School of Economics with its existing personnel.

Influenced by these considerations, the Moscow Commercial Institute set up an economic committee, whose duty it was to see that the Institute had always at its disposal the necessary information as to the condition of the market, and to be prepared at any moment to conduct a quick investigation of some section of it. The work of the committee was of a purely organizing and coördinating character; it rested with the research school of the Institute, under the direction of experts, to tabulate the data obtained. Accordingly, the primary task of this economic committee was to register the main facts of industry and commerce; secondly, it had to train a number of students who would be ready to carry out any special work required. The idea itself was excellent, but the committee succeeded in accomplishing its task only in so far as it really assisted the research school of the Institute in working out the current economic facts. The committee made an attempt to get into closer touch with some of the war industries committees and other organizations which had to make

[8] *Russkya Vedomosty,* Moscow, 1915, No. 193.

wholesale purchases, but failed to do so. This was due, perhaps, to the fact that the period of rapid fluctuations in prices had then set in, and research being unable to keep abreast of these rapid fluctuations, they could be registered only retrospectively. Such registration in itself was of a great theoretical importance and to some extent facilitated practical conclusions. But, as regards direct assistance in making purchases, it came inevitably too late, the more so since the prices of commodities varied greatly with the degree of remoteness from the large centers. They varied even within the same locality. A similar attempt was made in the Commercial Institute of Kharkov by Professor Fomin, who set up a special office to study the economics of the southern part of Russia. His object was the same—to register the current facts of economic life. One of the services rendered by this office was the publication of a series of periodical bulletins, in which its extremely useful work was summarized. These bulletins contained information concerning the industries of southern Russia, including statistics of the output of salt, coal, and ores, the prices of various commodities, the rates of exchange, etc. These data were usually presented in the form of diagrams and charts, thus enabling one to grasp the changes that were taking place in the industrial situation.

The second year of the War, which brought with it such severe ordeals for Russia, revealed, moreover, not only a scarcity of munitions and necessaries of life, but also a shortage of man-power, of soldiers and officers. Owing to its immense length, the Russian front constantly required considerable reinforcements, and whereas the lack of men was made good by the ordinary conscriptions of recruits and by calling up reservists of older classes, in order to compensate the loss of officers it became necessary to start special short courses of instruction in the military schools and to found new training schools for officers. It was natural that no one should appear better qualified than the students of the universities and technical colleges, by reason of their education and mental development, to pass quickly through the necessary course of training and be commissioned as officers. It was therefore decided that the first thing to do was to send them to the military schools. As has already been said above, students of universities and technical schools had hitherto been exempted from military service until they had graduated, but the Russian Conscription Law provided for the withdrawal of this

exemption under special circumstances. It had been suggested at the very beginning of the War that it might be necessary to take this step. On September 30, 1914, the Emperor confirmed the decision of the Council of Ministers empowering the Minister of War to call these young men to the army. Under the decision of the Council of Ministers the students thus conscripted would be permitted to resume their studies if their compulsory period of military service had not elapsed at the end of the War and to complete their service after graduation.

Among the causes which delayed the conscription of students until 1916 was the fact that many students, without waiting for conscription, enlisted as volunteers in the army or entered officers' training schools. It is impossible at the present day to establish exactly the number of such volunteers. But we have in our possession figures which allow us to judge approximately of the magnitude of the volunteer movement among students. At the annual meeting of the University of Moscow on January 12, 1916, the Rector of the University mentioned in his address that in the past year 700 students of that university had voluntarily entered officers' training schools. Judging from available information, the corresponding figure for the University of Petrograd would not be less. Taking into consideration all the universities and technical colleges of Russia, we must reckon the number of students who voluntarily joined officers' training schools in the course of 1915 at about 10,000 to 12,000, or about 10 to 12 per cent of the total number of male students, estimating the latter, according to the figures relating to that period, at 100,000. But the enormous losses that the Russian army had latterly suffered in respect of officers constantly suggested the necessity of conscription. During the unhappy autumn of 1915, when everybody in Russia was anxiously seeking a way out of the increasing difficulties, the question was raised again.

On September 15, 1915, a government conference presided over by General Belyaev, Under-Secretary for War, discussed the question of mobilizing the students. All the Ministries were represented at the conference. General Belyaev acquainted those present with the proposal of the Ministry of War for the conscription of students, as foreseen by the ukase of September 30, 1914, and said that the time had come to give effect to the proposal in view of the heavy losses in officers. Seeing that the training of officers would require a con-

siderable time, the Ministry of War proposed to start conscription as soon as possible. The conference discussed the question of the age and standing of the students who should be called up in the first instance, and it was decided that the youngest students, both in age and in standing, ought to be the first to be conscribed, but that the conscription should apply to all the universities and higher technical schools. The Minister of Education, Count Ignatiev, expressed the point of view of his Department in a special memorandum which he submitted to the Prime Minister. That memorandum dealt primarily with the organization of studies in the schools that had been evacuated from the neighborhood of the theater of war. But incidentally it referred also to the general problem of the universities in the time of war, insisting that their work ought to proceed without interruption and that the students should graduate as rapidly as possible. From this the Minister of Education drew the conclusion that the conscription of students before they had graduated ought to be resorted to only in exceptional cases, when it was dictated by the evident necessity of reinforcing the ranks of officers. Count Ignatiev also referred to the necessity of having a large and well-trained medical personnel and of the growing need of educated workers in general. It was important at that time, ran the memorandum, that students should graduate as soon as possible, because a large number of the trained officials in State departments had been called to the army and would not return to their work. Foreseeing this eventuality and believing that after the War was over many properly trained men and women would be required for the work of restoring normal condition throughout the country, the Minister of Education urged that only in emergencies should students be mobilized before the time.

As we have seen, the Ministry of War was likewise in no hurry to put into force the proposed measure. Four months elapsed after the conference presided over by General Belyaev on September 15, 1915, before action was taken on the suggestions adopted by that conference. It was only on February 13 of the following year that the decision of the Council of Ministers confirmed by the Emperor on January 31 was promulgated. It referred to the "enrolment in the army during the present war of the young men hitherto exempted from military service until their graduation from the universities." Under it were to be called to the army in the first instance young men born in 1895, first freshmen and then second-year students. Then

were to follow in the same order those born in 1894 and earlier, until all the young men of twenty-one and upward in their first two years of residence had been exhausted. Then would come the turn of the third-year men, to be called up in the same order. The following categories were to be exempt from conscription: (a) students of all universities in their last year; (b) students of the higher technical schools in their last two years; (c) students of the first class of the Alexander College and of the Petrograd School of Law; (d) all students of medical schools and of veterinary institutes.

All these exemptions were easily comprehensible except the exemption of students of the Alexander College and of the School of Law. The general public could attribute it only to the fact that these two privileged schools were intended chiefly for the training of those who might wish to enter the civil service.

As for the carrying out of the conscription, it was entrusted to the university administrations. Every university and technical college was required to prepare a list of the conscripts and to ascertain how many of the exempt students had decided to volunteer. This done, the conscripts proceeded to draw lots and those who drew the lowest numbers were exempted, up to the number of the volunteers, until the next conscription. It was intended to carry out the conscription on six consecutive dates between March 15 and May 15; in fact, it was extended over a much longer period, beginning earlier and ending later than the dates originally fixed. According to the instruction issued to all universities, the lots were to be drawn at open meetings presided over by the heads of the university and in the presence of all the conscripts. Representatives of the latter were to take part in drawing the lots and to see that all the proceedings were regular. In Moscow the first meetings of this kind took place as early as March 7. They were held amidst great enthusiasm. The chairmen of the meetings delivered addresses in which they dwelt on the meaning of the conscription and on the duty of all to serve their country, and urged those who were going to the War to keep in touch with their university. These words were received with loud applause by the students. Not a single voice was raised to disturb this general patriotic harmony; nobody objected to the conscription. No doubt, now as at the beginning of the War, there were men holding radical and even revolutionary opinions. But they dared not reveal these, for the general sentiment was opposed to them. There were certainly in

Russia enemies of the War, just as in Europe there were Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences; but for the time being these enemies remained in hiding and conducted their propaganda in secret, awaiting more favorable conditions. Of course, there were such enemies of the War also among the students.

During the spring of 1916 the solemn meetings at which lots were drawn and the order of conscription determined proceeded amidst patriotic enthusiasm. But in the same spring there began to be felt a certain change in the mental attitude of the students. It was produced by various circumstances which eventually led to the Revolution of 1917. It does not fall within our task to analyze these circumstances in full. We must confine ourselves to describing the social and economic changes which the War brought about in the universities and technical schools and among the students. In the next chapter we shall describe those changes which created conditions favorable to the growth among them of a feeling of hostility to the Government.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE WAR ON UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

In the preceding chapter I have described the effect of the War on the inner life of the Russian universities, on the ideas, feelings, and doings of their professors and students. From what I have written the inference can already be drawn that the War, after having at first captured all hearts by its lofty aims, was gradually losing its heroic character and assuming the shape of a great catastrophe threatening the entire civilization of Europe. This idea was expressed in clear and distinct form by some eminent thinkers, but it was also vaguely and instinctively felt by the general public and was gradually gaining ground. Whereas at the front, where soldiers had to face continual danger, the leaders of the army showed their usual coolness and courage, at home various symptoms of fatigue, despondency, and concern began to manifest themselves. These were attributable to many and complicated causes; but they were certainly connected with those outward social and economic consequences which the War, so unexpectedly protracted, had brought about. If even the Germans, with all their organization and discipline, with their much greater homogeneity and unity, were finally shaken and crushed under the burden of such unprecedented military exertions, how much more readily, nay inevitably, would this fate befall the Russian people, which had never undergone so austere a training and represented moreover a scattered and heterogeneous national agglomeration.

Lack of technical training and of adequate political organization was another great disadvantage on the Russian side, which made the social and economic consequences of the War still more disastrous. Gradually, as the heavy blows of the War made themselves more acutely felt in the interior, the feelings of discontent and fatigue became increasingly pronounced. The effects of the general dislocation began to tell on academic life. Not only was it impossible to satisfy the fresh demand for additional universities, but even in respect of

their everyday requirements the existing universities began to experience all sorts of material difficulties and privations. The very composition of the student class underwent a noticeable change owing to the mobilization of a considerable number of undergraduates. The groups of the Left again made their appearance, and there was a growth of anti-Government feeling.

I should like to point out here that this latter fact, like the other facts in the life of the universities that I have just mentioned, was due to some general cause, for throughout the War the policy of the Ministry of Education with regard to the universities was a benevolent one. When the War broke out, the Minister of Education, M. Kasso, of whose work we have spoken in Chapter I, was seriously ill. He died on November 27, 1914. About a month later, on January 10, 1915, Count Ignatiev, then Assistant Minister of Agriculture, was appointed to succeed him. The new appointment was received with the greatest satisfaction both by the press and by public opinion. The first words pronounced by the new Minister when he took office showed that the period of oppression and persecution was over and that a new policy was about to be inaugurated, at the root of which lay consideration for the educational needs of the country. In the Budget Committee of the Duma Count Ignatiev declared in the course of his speech that the problem of the university statutes must be solved, that its solution could be neither postponed nor avoided, and that he wished to solve it in concert with the Duma. He was still more determined and resolute in his speech at the conference of the curators of educational districts which sat from February 20 to February 27, 1915. He said in his inaugural address:

> The unsympathetic and formal attitude of the school toward the problems of life which has existed hitherto, as well as the lack of indispensable personal contact with local groups and individual citizens, has contributed to the gradual severance of relations between the school and the public. . . . The State principle in school life must remain inviolable. . . . But we for our part must satisfy the needs of the community. We must introduce more warmth and kindliness into the cause of education. Of course our work must be confined within the limits fixed by the law, but even in those limits one can be responsive to the demands of life. The best of intentions are killed by dry formalism.

These words contained an outspoken condemnation of the recent policy of Kasso; and the Russian public, unaccustomed to such pro-

nouncements, welcomed with great relief the declaration of the new Minister that he wished to work in harmony with the Duma.

In carrying out his scheme of educational reform, particularly with regard to the universities, Count Ignatiev did actually show great energy. The revision of the University Statutes was completed on May 14, 1915. In the new draft the principle of autonomy was fully recognized. University councils took objection to some minor clauses of the new statutes, but on the whole these were based upon the principle of good will toward, and confidence in the academic bodies. And although, owing to certain circumstances connected with the general slowing down of the legislative machinery at that time, the scheme of Count Ignatiev was not carried into effect, nevertheless his efforts and his sympathetic attitude toward both the universities and schools at large, met with general recognition. There were certain shortcomings in his mild and liberal policy, due to lack of experience in academic matters. Some of Count Ignatiev's orders and decisions were certainly unjustified and wrong; he rejected too easily some of the proposals of the universities. But on the whole his program was in keeping with what public opinion demanded from him and soon his name attained great popularity, an almost unheard-of success for a Minister of Education in Russia. When, more than a year after his appointment, on March 14 and 15, 1916, the Duma was again discussing the estimates of the Ministry of Education, Count Ignatiev once more emphasized the desirability of coöperation between the Ministry and the public. "The Ministry," said Count Ignatiev, "must meet half-way the wishes of the nation; it must draw into its work the whole community, all the living forces of the country. It must create conditions for lasting and fruitful work in this field."

Among other things Count Ignatiev was strongly in favor of one of the objects most ardently desired by the Russian public: a larger number of universities. We have dealt with this need in Chapter I. The War did not dispel the desire, but on the contrary rendered it more acute. In many respects it had revealed Russia's unpreparedness and had strikingly emphasized her educational shortcomings. And in spite of the growing burden of war expenditure and the increase of general poverty, the creation of new universities was loudly demanded on all sides. Not only other Ministries, but even the Ministry of Education now responded to the general prayer. In the last

days of May 1916, the Minister of Education submitted a memorandum to the Council of Ministers in which he urged the immediate opening of ten new universities in various parts of Russia. In support of his scheme Count Ignatiev adduced the following facts. During the past ten years only one new university had been created (in Saratov), whereas during the same period the number of secondary schools had been doubled, the number of boys' gymnasia increased from 286 to 600, of *real* schools[1] from 164 to 332, of girls' gymnasia from 743 to 1,221. Boys and girls to the number of 22,000 were annually leaving secondary schools and 10 per cent of them were unable to get admission into universities and higher schools. During the last twenty years the number of students had doubled and the existing universities were overcrowded. The need of medical schools was particularly acute. On the strength of these facts the Minister of Education decided to proceed to the creation of several new universities, at first opening only the faculties most needed.

This disposition on the part of the Ministry to open new universities was supported by persistent and energetic demands and recommendations from large sections of the Russian public. Various towns granted or collected considerable sums of money (in Perm, for instance, three million rubles were collected), granted sites, or made loans to meet the requirements of the future universities. Even peasants took part in the movement; in the province of Perm many of the village consumers' coöperative societies responded to the appeal of the Union of Consumers' Societies of the Northeastern Region by making grants for the proposed university. One of these societies, in the village of Mokhovaya, contributed only ten rubles from its scanty means; but, as one of the educational magazines of the day observed, it was verily "the widow's mite of the semi-illiterate peasants." Again, as had happened before the War, several towns competed as to which should have its university. Some demanded a university, others a polytechnic institute. The whole country was clamoring for education and the hardships of the War could not check the impulse. Yet however lavish the contributions of various towns, it was impossible to proceed to the creation of new universities without considerable grants out of the State Treasury, and here figures suffice to show why the development of universities was hampered. The enormous war expenditure placed the Government in

[1] *See* above, p. 28 sqq.

serious financial straits.[2] The following table shows the expenditure of the Ministry of Education for general purposes and for universities and technical schools during the years 1915 to 1917:

Expenditures	*1915*	*1916* (*in rubles*)	*1917*
For general purposes	158,935,230	195,623,813	214,212,021
For universities and higher technical schools	10,644,800	10,685,041	14,339,155

If we consider the increasing cost of living and the fall in the rate of exchange of the ruble, two causes of the increase of expenditure in 1917, and if we take into account that under the law of 1916 "concerning the temporary improvement of the material situation of the professors" a great portion of the increase in that year (1,171,000 rubles) went to augment the salaries of the personnel, we must find that during the three years 1915 to 1917 expenditure on higher education remained practically the same and formed an insignificant proportion of the total expenditure of the Ministry of Education, being in 1917 only 8.1 per cent of that total expenditure. Thus it happened that although the memorandum which Count Ignatiev submitted to the Council of Ministers in May 1916 spoke of the immediate opening of ten new universities, and the public did all they could to support it, the burden of war expenditure was such as to paralyze both the energy of the Ministry of Education and the perseverance of the public. Indeed, instead of ten new universities referred to in the memorandum, it was found possible to create only one, in Perm, where considerable funds had been raised from local sources. The explanatory memorandum of the Minister of Finance to the Budget Estimate for 1917 spoke only of a modest grant of 260,000 rubles for the maintenance of ten auxiliary educational institutions to be opened in the universities. This was of course a mere drop in the ocean of general educational wants. Only later, after the Revolution, when Russia had withdrawn from the War, was a beginning made and numerous new universities opened, spasmodically and without method, in various parts of Russia. But their

[2] *Cf.* A. M. Michelson, *Revenue and Expenditure of the Russian Government during the War,* in the volume, *Russian Public Finance during the War,* in this series of the *Economic and Social History of the World War,* Yale University Press, 1928.

material existence was utterly insecure, and most of them were doomed to a speedy end.

But not only was the expenditure on higher education insufficient in the number of universities, although its urgency was recognized both by the Government and by the public; even the immediate requirements of the existing universities remained unsatisfied. In January, 1914, that is, six months before the outbreak of the War, Professor Bagaley, Member of the State Council, published an article[3] in which he summed up the needs of the Russian universities. According to his estimates, the requirements of the universities in buildings alone represented 7,800,000 rubles. Most universities felt an acute want of new libraries, clinics, laboratories, and various auxiliary educational establishments, indispensable in any progressive school. They were particularly needed under the conditions of an extraordinarily rapid development of all branches of knowledge which characterized the last decades before the War. But it was precisely the apportionment for construction and repairs of buildings that gradually fell off during the War. In 1917, they were reduced to less than one-half of the figures for 1913 and 1914, and in view of the rapid decline in the purchasing power of the ruble, the ratio appears still more unfavorable.

Actual Expenditure		*Estimated Expenditure*		
1913	*1914*	*1915*	*1916*	*1917*
(*in thousands of rubles*)				
22,292	22,236	16,528	16,679	10,879

These figures refer not only to the universities, but also to the higher technical, secondary, and primary schools of the Ministry of Education. It is evident that with the reduction of the total grant for the construction and repair of all educational premises to 16 million and later to 10 million rubles, it was impossible to spend 7 or 8 million rubles on the building requirements of the universities alone. No doubt, these needs might have been satisfied gradually, but here a new obstacle presented itself: building materials of all kinds were among the commodities which showed a particularly rapid rise in prices. It may be said, therefore, that the War stopped, or interrupted for a number of years building activities in connection with Russian uni-

[3] Bagaley, *Ekonomicheskoe polozhenie nashikh universitetov* (*The Economic Condition of Our Universities*), in *Vestnik Evropi*, January 1914.

versities. Most of the schemes of expansion prepared before the summer of 1914 proved unrealizable. Some of the buildings under construction, even those that had been roofed by the autumn of 1914, remained unfinished throughout the War. They bore mute witness to the financial straits of the Ministry of Education. As instances of such unfinished buildings I may mention the University Library at Kiev and the School of Geology and Mineralogy of the University of Moscow. Thus, the War put an end to the physical expansion of the Russian universities and this, of course, interfered with their academic work. If we remember that nearly all the universities responded in one way or another to war-time demands, offering part of their premises either for hospitals or for the manufacture of munitions, we shall readily conceive the outward conditions of university life during the War.

Yet, those universities which had to leave their permanent residence and withdraw inland must have experienced still greater discomfort and privations. This was especially so in the second year of the War. The retreat of the Russian troops from Galicia and Poland to the banks of the Nyeman and Dvina, which resulted in the evacuation of many provinces of the western and southwestern regions, necessitated the evacuation of the universities situated in the districts abandoned, and to some extent also in the localities near the front and menaced by the invasion. These included the Universities of Warsaw and of Kiev (the latter with the exception of the School of Medicine), the Polytechnic Institutes of Warsaw and of Riga, the Agricultural Institute of Novo-Alexandria, the Commercial Institute of Kiev, and the Women's Universities of Warsaw and Kiev. All these establishments had to be transferred with their professors and students into the inland parts of Russia. Several towns began to compete for the privilege of offering them hospitality. Finally, the University, the Women's University, and the Commercial Institute of Kiev were transferred to Saratov; the Polytechnic Institute of Riga went to Moscow; the Polytechnic Institute of Warsaw, first to Moscow and then to Nizhni-Novgorod; the University of Warsaw to Rostov-on-Don; the Agricultural Institute of Novo-Alexandria to Kharkov. The evacuation of the Polytechnic Institute of Kiev was temporarily postponed. The University of Yuriev (Dorpat) made elaborate preparations for its evacuation, but remained where it was throughout the War, and only in 1918, under the Soviet Govern-

ment, was transferred to Voronezh. Only the Universities and Commercial Institute of Kiev returned to Kiev after a year, when the danger was over.

For the rest of them, the temporary evacuation was turned into a permanent removal to more inland localities, for after the War the districts from which they had been transferred were detached from the Russian Empire. It goes without saying that the mere preparations for evacuation resulted in some disorganization of academic life. Sometimes a considerable part of the university property was left behind; sometimes the most valuable possessions were hurriedly sent in advance before the removal of the university itself. Thus, it happened that a considerable portion of the library of the University of Yuriev was removed to Perm, whereas the University itself remained in Yuriev for a long time and was then transferred to Voronezh. Nor did all the universities easily and with equal convenience settle down in their new quarters. Those transferred to Moscow found there excellent libraries and well-equipped workrooms, laboratories, etc., but their students often met with great difficulty in obtaining admission to these places, owing to lack of room. Even the Moscow students had to take turns for admission. The Polytechnic Institute of Warsaw, which was temporarily located in Moscow while premises were being prepared for it in Nizhni-Novgorod, was unable to start any regular work there; all it could do was to organize a few lectures in one of the secondary schools and to reopen its offices in a private house. On reaching Nizhni-Novgorod, where there had hitherto been no university or technical school at all, the Institute again had considerable difficulty in finding accommodation both for lectures and other studies, and for its professors. Lectures went on in a hotel specially requisitioned for the purpose, and in the building of one of the secondary schools. The Institute could hardly feel comfortable under these conditions. Gradually, however, thanks to the great assistance of the municipality, the Institute set about its normal work. In 1917, under the Provisional Government, it was decided to transfer it definitely to Nizhni-Novgorod. A site was allotted to it by the municipality and there was some talk of erecting new buildings. The Bolshevik *coup d'état* prevented these plans from being realized. Under the Soviet Government the former Polytechnic Institute of Warsaw was closed in consequence of its "reactionary"

character. This was the end of what had once been a particularly well-equipped establishment.

The fate of other evacuated higher schools was not so unfortunate, but they likewise had difficulties to overcome in their new homes. The University of Kiev found in Saratov excellent lecture halls in the new buildings of the Medical School, and the professors of the Faculties of Law, History, and Mathematics, in short all those who for their lectures did not require any complicated apparatus, were soon able to resume tuition. Much more difficult was the position of the professors of the Faculty of Science, for at Saratov there was neither sufficient accommodation, nor proper equipment for teaching science. A great scarcity of books was felt equally by all the faculties. Both professors and students had to do without that great variety of publications, research works, textbooks, books of reference, and dictionaries, which is indispensable to regular academic work. The library of the University of Kiev was transferred to Saratov simultaneously with the University itself, but in view of the uncertain situation it remained there without being unpacked for a whole year, and was then sent back. No wonder that, in spite of the fact that the accommodation at Saratov presented certain advantages, the University of Kiev asked to be sent back to Kiev as soon as the latter town was out of danger. Its return was effected in the summer of 1916.

Whenever it was thought that a university removed to some town might eventually remain there, heroic efforts were made to place it in the best possible conditions. This was the case, for example, with the University of Warsaw, removed to Rostov-on-Don. The town placed at the disposal of the University not only a splendid building recently erected for some other purpose, which it was possible to use for lecture halls and library, but also another building for the accommodation of the Physical Institute and of various laboratories and clinics. Certain Moscow and Petrograd libraries, such as the Imperial Library, the library of the Military Medical Academy, of the Rumyantsev Museum and others, sent gifts of their duplicate copies of books to the new University of Rostov whose library had been left in Warsaw. To these were added private donations and its own acquisitions, and in two years' time the University of Rostov had already a fairly large library. Similar hospitality was shown to the Institute of Forestry and Agriculture of Novo-Alexandria, which

was formerly located in the Province of Lublin, in Poland, in the very center of the military operations, and which was in great haste removed to Kharkov. The large library of the Institute and the whole of its equipment were left behind. Only the cattle from the Institute's dairy farm were sent to Kharkov. At Kharkov it was found necessary to accommodate the Institute in various premises belonging to the University, to technical and secondary schools, as well as in private houses. The Institute had to make use of the lecture halls, laboratories, and workrooms of the Kharkov University, Technological Institute, Veterinary Institute, and of the secondary agricultural school in Dergachi near Kharkov. The town offered the Institute an allotment of forest for demonstration purposes and a large piece of land near the Municipal Gardens. Later on, the Institute was placed in possession of large premises of the Women's University and of the former Nobility Boarding School, and became firmly settled in Kharkov.

But, generally speaking, the removal of universities from their permanent abodes to new localities seriously hindered, if it did not completely disorganize the regular course of academic and scientific work. The only matter for surprise is the ease with which they adapted themselves to the new conditions, in spite of all difficulties. This testifies to that peculiar stability of the inner structure of academic institutions of which we spoke in the first chapter and of which we shall have further illustrations in the course of our narrative. Yet, as the War went on and the material difficulties connected with it became increasingly pronounced, the universities began to feel their burden more acutely. This was manifested both in the general conditions of work in the universities, and in the condition and mentality of their students. The former suffered to an increasing degree from the growing general dislocation of the economic life of the country. It was becoming difficult for university authorities to run them on businesslike lines, and to make the revenue from the government grants and students' fees suffice to meet the incessantly rising cost of living. The increasing acuteness of the fuel crisis was a constant menace to regular studies. To this was added the difficulty of lighting due to gradual reductions in the output of electric power. Next came, with grievous fatality, various other troubles, which sorely affected normal university life; there was lack of paper, lack of books and scholastic accessories, lack of laboratory apparatus, and so on.

In addition, certain items of university expenditure increased with such alarming rapidity as to absorb the greater part of their resources. These were in particular the cost of fuel and servants' wages.

When, in June 1917, soon after the outbreak of the Revolution, the rectors of the universities were summoned by the Ministry of Education to the convention in Petrograd, the account that they gave of the material conditions of life in the universities at the end of the third year of the War furnished a striking picture of genuine financial distress, due to the general economic disruption of the country. It was shown that the old budget grants covered but a small portion of the total requirements. The special resources of the universities derived from tuition fees were now insignificant in relation to the increased expenditure. The professors' salaries were obviously insufficient. Professor Graves, of the University of Petrograd, summed up the opinions expressed with regard to the material conditions of the universities as follows:[4]

> The picture of the financial crisis given by the rectors . . . inspires grave apprehension, and calls for radical measures. . . . As a result of a decreased activity in the publishing trade, students will be left without books, just as now they can scarcely procure food and accommodation. We are threatened with a return of spiritual and cultural poverty. A black cloud is approaching; it does not bring with it promise of refreshing rain for the universities, but is about to burst upon them with storm and gale. . . . The professors [thus Professor Graves concluded his sad reflections] will go on with the hard work which has become their life work. They are ready to take upon their shoulders even the new burden connected with university autonomy and to suffer privations due to the economic crisis. But the State must devise some large scheme of assistance to the academic world.

In these few words Professor Graves lucidly depicted the sorry plight of the universities. He appealed to the State to come to their assistance, but when he wrote his article, in the middle of 1917, the Government was already at grips with the forces let loose by the Revolution, and the painful forebodings with which Russian scholars viewed the approach of the black cloud betokened a fairly accurate forecast of coming events.

As we have observed, the economic consequences of the War told

[4] See *Rech*, June 25, 1917.

both on the general condition of the universities and on the plight and mental attitude of the students. We must now turn to the latter, beginning with the outward facts of their life, and passing on to the psychological conditions. Here, too, the three years of the War had brought about some drastic changes. The exalted patriotism and general enthusiasm which we saw at the beginning of the War had given place in some students to a mere feeling of fatigue; in others, to sentiments of hostility toward the Government. There were, of course, staunch and heroic minds which remained true to their original patriotic ideals, but these were no longer able to evoke similar feelings in the large mass of students.

In order to explain these changes we must begin by examining the effect of the economic difficulties of the time on the life of the students. Let us first take the housing crisis, which became apparent in certain university cities at the beginning of the second year of the War and exerted a great influence on the life of the students. As early as September 1915 there were bitter complaints of the shortage of housing accommodation, especially in the great cities like Petrograd and Moscow. Owing to the abundance and variety of their educational establishments, these two cities had always proved particularly attractive to young men from all parts of Russia, including the most remote, such as the Caucasus, Central Asia, and the Far East. To this normal migration, which the transport difficulties of war-time by no means arrested, was added from the very outbreak of the War a growing influx of refugee students from the western provinces of Russia occupied by the enemy. While in Saratov, where there used to be only a medical school and a very small number of students, it was still possible, though difficult, to find accommodation for professors and students of the various educational establishments removed thither from Kiev; in Moscow, in the autumn of 1915 this could not be done by normal methods. The housing shortage made itself felt there very early. It pressed with special severity on the newly arriving students, including the refugees evacuated to Moscow from various parts of Russia, who were unfamiliar with the town.

When in September 1915 the constant flow of refugees was augmented by all the students who had returned to Moscow after their vacations, many searched in vain for lodgings. A striking picture of the difficulties with which the students were confronted in this respect is to be found in the statement addressed at the time to the mayor of

Moscow by M. Diatroptov, member of the Committee of Medical Assistance to Students, and M. Titov, Secretary of the same committee, which contained the following passage:

> The increase in the population of Moscow due to war-time conditions has greatly affected the most essential interests of the vast majority of the students of the University and technical schools of Moscow. Students are vainly looking for accommodation regardless of distance or of sanitary conditions; being unable to find any, they are spending hours at the railway stations, in tea rooms, and in the streets. Finally, in despair they leave Moscow, with heavy hearts and with their last pennies in their pockets, thus abandoning all hope of continuing their education.

The difficult position in which students were placed on arriving at Moscow attracted the attention of the Moscow press and public. A well-known public man and benefactor of Moscow, M. Chetverikov, wrote in this connection in the newspaper *Russkya Vedomosti* as follows: "To return home with broken hopes, with life definitely ruined, this means a death sentence on what is most valuable to the country at the present moment: its rising generation. Enough of them are already perishing at the front." M. Chetverikov appealed to the public of Moscow to help the students, and headed the subscription list with a contribution of 3,000 rubles. The Committee of Medical Assistance to Students undertook with the help of the Moscow municipality the organization of a clearing station for one hundred students, whence they were afterward distributed among boarding houses and private lodgings. Several technical schools organized hostels for their students, and for the time being the acute shortage was somewhat relieved.

However, in view of the growing want of accommodation and the increasing food difficulties, the Ministry of Education issued a special ordinance on June 24, 1916, limiting the admission of new students to certain universities, those of Petrograd, Moscow, Yuriev, Kiev, and Kharkov. In explaining this measure, the ordinance referred to "the exceptional conditions of war-time, which have caused a rise in the prices of the necessaries of life and a shortage and dearness of housing," these factors in their turn "telling heavily on the plight of the poorer students." The number of students to be admitted was fixed as follows: to the University of Petrograd, 1,900; to that of Moscow, 2,150; of Kiev, 1,100; of Kharkov, 1,050; of

Yuriev, 550. In order to appreciate the extent of the proposed reductions, it must be remembered that formerly in Petrograd 1,900 students were often admitted to the Faculty of Law alone, whereas in Moscow in 1915 there were 4,950 admissions. The limits fixed by the Ministry of Education were impracticable, and during 1916, for instance, 3,369 students were admitted to the University of Moscow, a little less, that is, than in 1914 when the number of admissions was 3,565. Some of these admissions no doubt date back to the first half of the year, before the ordinance of June 24, but generally the figures of 1914 and 1916 more or less coincide. If we add that other Ministries did not limit the admission of students to the technical schools under their control, we shall understand why there was a repetition of the housing crisis in the autumn of 1916, and why the same appeals for assistance to the students was launched as in 1915. The number of applications for admission to the universities in the autumn of 1916 show that the influx, except as regards the medical schools, had diminished as compared with 1915. But the number of applicants for admission to the technical schools showed a considerable increase.

No wonder, then, that as early as August 27, 1916, the Committee of Medical Assistance to Students of Moscow published an open letter to the Moscow students and public, in which they said:

> This year there is a still more acute and hopeless shortage of accommodation, especially for women students. . . . The houseless condition of the Moscow students is now a fact beyond question, and it is daily becoming worse. Moscow cannot and must not allow a repetition of the deplorable, let us even say shameful sight of homeless students spending nights at the railroad stations, on the boulevards, in night restaurants, etc.

A similar appeal to the Society for the Relief of Sick and Impecunious Students of Kharkov appeared in the Kharkov papers. The Society recalled the first months of the War when hospitality was offered by private persons to sick and wounded soldiers, and claimed the same hospitality for students who had no lodgings: "Let the homeless and lonely student spend a night at your home." Even in such a remote southern center as Odessa we find students suffering from the same acute lack of house room. Here, too, the crisis was due to the same general cause, the great influx of refugees. An association

of ladies connected with the University, presided over by Madame Nabokikh, widow of the late Professor Nabokikh, organized assistance for the students by starting a temporary hostel. Generally speaking, newspaper articles drawing attention to the want of accommodation for students were appearing with increasing frequency, both in the capitals and in the provincial towns. The situation was becoming alarming. The work of different societies and of the municipalities which organized student hostels was of enormous benefit to the students and to the universities.

But of course it was not only from the housing crisis that students suffered at that time: there was general impoverishment, due to the high cost of living and lack of resources. The great majority of students were unable to pay their tuition fees. Consequently, a proposal was made in the Duma to set up a special government fund out of which loans could be made to students to enable them to pay their fees. As early as 1915 reports of societies for assisting students showed an increase in their issues of various allowances in money and in kind, and at the same time a decrease in their funds: thus the Moscow society distributed in 1913, the last year before the War, 2,470 rubles and 130,000 free meals, whereas in 1915 it distributed 11,000 rubles, and the number of free meals given during the two autumn months alone was 75,000. As a result of this increase in the allowances coupled with a diminution of voluntary contributions to the society, there was a decrease in the amount of tuition fees defrayed by it: in 1913, 44,374 rubles were paid for 1,460 students; in 1915, 34,679 rubles for 1,188 students. The total number of students in the University of Moscow toward the end of 1913 was 9,892, whereas at the end of 1915 it reached 11,184, and the number of impecunious students among them had certainly greatly increased. Even in Tomsk, far away in Siberia, notwithstanding its remoteness from the front and from the great centers, the need was so great that the Students' Relief Society spent in 1915 all its available funds. The situation was the same everywhere.

The autumn of 1916 and the beginning of the new academic year brought with them a further increase of general impoverishment and a new rise in the cost of living. Both were the consequences of the War. High cost of living, profiteering, lack of food products, these were the standing topics of the day. And the severe material conditions began to influence the attitude of the public and the mentality

of the young. Owing to the economic difficulties in Petrograd and Moscow and to the comparative cheapness of living in the country, many students, unable to subsist on their scanty means in the large centers, began to leave the universities of the capitals, either returning home or taking up some employment. On the other hand, hundreds of young men from every university were in that year called to military service, in pursuance of the ukase of January 31, 1916 referred to above. Finally, in view of the general insecurity and the difficulties of the situation, many senior students were endeavoring to graduate as soon as possible. This explains why so many students were leaving the universities at that time. For example, 7,693 left the University of Moscow in the period between January 1, 1916 and January 1, 1917. It was an unprecedented number in the annals of that university. The following figures taken from the reports relating to it throw an interesting light on the changes that occurred in the composition of the student body of the University of Moscow during the War.

	Jan. 1, 1915	*Jan. 1, 1916*	*Jan. 1, 1917*
Students registered	9,129	11,184	6,860
	Jan. 1, 1914-Jan. 1, 1915	*Jan. 1, 1915-Jan. 1, 1916*	*Jan. 1, 1916-Jan. 1, 1917*
Students who left the university:			
before graduation	2,535	2,208	5,848
after graduation	1,793	687	1,845
Total	4,328	2,895	7,693
Students admitted	3,565	4,950	3,369

It follows from these interesting data that in 1916 over one-half of the total number of students left the University of Moscow and of the 6,860 remaining on January 1, 1917, many were freshmen, so that on the whole the composition of the student body had greatly changed. There were also many who during that year enlisted voluntarily in the army, not waiting for the conscription which took place in March. Similar changes in the membership of other universities could easily be discovered, especially in the capitals. It was chiefly the more spirited students, those who wished to defend their country, who went away. At the same time, in 1915 and even in 1916, in spite of the Ministry's order limiting the number of new admissions, a great many young men, mostly too young for conscription, were ad-

mitted to the University of Moscow as well as to other universities. This is attributable not only to the natural increase in the number of those who were leaving secondary schools, but also to the fact that under the instructions of the new Minister of Education, Count Ignatiev, new categories were henceforward admissible to the universities. Already in the summer of 1915 the Minister, by his ordinance of July 8, had granted to the students of theological seminaries who had completed four years of studies the right of admission to universities.

On September 1, 1915, the Minister addressed an ordinance to the curators of educational districts dealing with the admission—as external students and, upon passing a supplementary examination, as regular students—of the pupils of commercial, *real*, and other secondary schools, whose program did not coincide with those of the gymnasia. The admission of women to certain faculties of the universities, for example, the School of Medicine and the Faculty of Natural Science of the University of Kazan, the School of Medicine of the University of Saratov, the School of Medicine and Faculty of Law of the University of Tomsk, was also conceded by Count Ignatiev. These three universities were chosen as being the least crowded and having most vacancies. But it was intended in future to allow the admission of women in other universities also, should the university councils desire it. In 1915, moreover, on the initiative of Count Ignatiev, the Jewish quota in the universities was increased. Hitherto it had been 3 per cent for the Universities of Moscow and Petrograd, and 10 per cent for the south of Russia. Count Ignatiev issued an ordinance allowing the admission, in excess of these percentages, of Jews who had some connection with the War, that is to say, such as had actually fought against the enemy or were exempted from military service on account of ill health, as well as children or adopted children of Jews who either had been called to the army or had enlisted voluntarily, or had served in the medical corps with distinction, or had been killed or wounded in the War. How large was the number of Jews to whom this ordinance was applicable may be seen from the fact that in 1915 over 600 Jews falling within its provisions were admitted to the University of Petrograd alone. Finally, the right of admission to the universities was granted to Poles who had been educated in Polish-speaking schools, and to all Slavs who had passed through secondary schools abroad.

Besides these new categories of persons to whom the universities were now thrown open, there were admitted in the usual way a considerable number of refugee students from the parts of Russia occupied by the enemy. As a result of all these new admissions, there was no depletion of the universities in spite of the great number of students who left them. In the autumns of 1915 and 1916 the work in universities began and proceeded in the usual way, but even as early as the end of 1915 there were traces among the students of those new feelings which in the second half of 1916 took the definite shape of an anti-Government movement. This new sentiment developed in a very complicated, perplexing manner. It is not easy to trace the different, sometimes diametrically opposite causes that produced it. On the whole the main features of the change in the students' mental attitude may be described as follows.

The War, as we have seen, had awakened a patriotic enthusiasm in the great mass of the students. Many devoted themselves in one way or another to war work. Private and personal interests were dropped into the background or forgotten. Those who remained in the universities and could combine war work with their ordinary duties, greatly appreciated the fact that they were enabled to pursue their studies. They were fully aware of their privileged and exceptional position. As some observers of that time said, "Youth has become quieter and more earnest." It sought more readily the support of its elders, showed more confidence in them, and more willingly acknowledged their authority. At the same time it had a clearer perception of its links with the body politic; it was being brought up in the feelings of patriotism and civic duty. The fact that "before the eyes of our youth a mobilization of public forces is proceeding which is possible only in times so exceptional that civic feelings run high, that sacrifices are made and that altruistic tendencies develop, is in itself a great lesson." The feeling of disinterested service to their country was being developed in the young. They were permeated with the spirit of idealism.

But if this exceptional state of mind, with its new and surprising emotions, elevated the young to a lofty plane of idealism, on the other hand it threw them to a certain extent out of the normal course of life. It was pointed out[5] that

[5] *Vestnik Vospitanya,* December 1915.

under normal conditions boys and girls at school already try to penetrate into the future and to discern their own part and position in it. At present the outlook is dark and uncertain. What is coming? Nobody knows. We only know—and this is what the young hear all around them —that the world catastrophe must lead to enormous changes . . . that colossal efforts will be required to heal the wounds caused by the War, that the main brunt of those efforts will fall on the shoulders of the younger generation. We shall have not only to make good the countless ravages of the War but to create new forms of life. . . . While not fully appreciating what this means, the growing generation instinctively forebodes it.

These forebodings of something new, unknown, and uncertain presently filled the young minds with anxiety and distress. Even while the War lasted a radical transformation was accomplished in the mentality not only of the young, but also of the old. Subsequently it was much intensified by the obscure and sinister events of the Revolution, the ordinary course of life was disturbed, the usual automatic working of cause and effect was interrupted, people entered the epoch of catastrophic changes and lost all sense of perspective. They accustomed themselves to live from hand to mouth, so to speak, not knowing and vainly trying to guess what the next day would bring forth.

Those who were spiritually strong, were made still stronger by this uncertainty; it gave them "firmness unbreakable." But in the great mass of average and weak students it aroused a sense of painful insecurity, of estrangement, of isolation, of abandonment, of homelessness. To these subtle and complex emotions were added at the end of 1915, with gradually increasing force as time went on, certain outward economic and political motives. The growing hardships of life were influencing an ever greater proportion of the students. The severe and prosaic conditions of war-time had a disheartening effect on those who were not taking any direct part in the War. The examples of patriotism and disinterested service to the country had lost something of their former educational value; the latter was weakened or paralyzed by the effects of material privations, and yielded under the lasting strain that the War imposed on everyone. The wave of public enthusiasm that arose in the summer of 1915 had also swept over the universities. Its results were now visible in the shape of the organized participation of students in the general war

effort. But at the root of that enthusiasm, which led to intensified public activities, lay a lack of faith in the Government, in its energy and ability to conduct the War. Under these conditions, it was natural that with the awakening of the students to the possibilities of independent work, the anti-Government elements among them should again come to the surface. These elements had not disappeared altogether on the outbreak of the War, but for a time they had become inactive. Now they came to the front again.

When the first tide of patriotic enthusiasm had ebbed away, when people began to speak loudly and openly of the blunders committed by the Government and of its responsibility for them, these elements of revolt resumed their activity among the students, trying to mold them into an anti-Government force. Almost simultaneously in Petrograd and in Moscow, in connection with the increased activity of the students in combatting the growing economic difficulties during the second half of 1915, ideas found expression behind which it is easy to distinguish the influence of these subversive elements. We have spoken above of the growth of misery among the students in 1915 and 1916. The Petrograd students, believing that "the economic difficulties and the utter helplessness of the students to resist them . . . are threatening to assume unheard of dimensions," decided to create a Mutual Relief Fund whose purpose would be to "unite the students on the basis of economic assistance." In the resolution passed by the organizers of the fund it was said, "The life of university students during the last years presents a lamentable picture of intellectual chaos and moral impoverishment; students have become mere visitors to the university, a leaderless flock foreign to the life of ideas, not aware of their own social importance, not intent upon the realization of their task." The resolution also drew attention to the dispersion of the students, to their lack of social training, and suggested that an economic association of students would be of a great service in this respect. These vague and abstract declarations, coming as they did in 1915, when the patriotism of the students and their efforts to satisfy the country's war needs had manifested themselves in so many ways, would be quite incomprehensible, if we did not take into account that they emanated from the student groups of the Left. These groups felt discontented because the War was reacting on the universities and overshadowing the students' own

public activities, by which was meant the training of students as a social force hostile to the Government.

Declarations contained in the Moscow students' magazines in the second half of 1915 had exactly the same purport. In one of these magazines,[6] it was suggested that "the public self-consciousness of the young, to whom the future belongs, can best be fortified in co-operative societies, in which an ever increasing number of students are held together by the most prosaic of interests." In another Moscow magazine,[7] similar ideas were preached. The period we were all living through was called a "period of social decadence, in which students display too obvious an indifference to many forms of their activities, to their associations"; at the same time, it was suggested that the organization of mutual relief would be "a good training for sound public spirit."

At times this return of the students to their old pre-war activities was due to patriotic motives. If many of the Russian revolutionaries —of the more eminent we may mention here Prince Kropotkin, the anarchist, and George Plekhanov, the well-known socialist—showed themselves ardent patriots and urged that the War should be carried on with the utmost energy, no wonder that among students anti-Government feelings were due not only to revolutionary, but also to patriotic motives. This complicated and not always obvious combination of motives in the students' opposition to the Government found excellent expression in the preface to the almanac *Put Studenchestva* (*The Students' Path*), published in Moscow in 1916. As may be seen from that preface, the almanac was already prepared in 1915, and the students' organizations, on being asked whether its publication would be opportune, decided in the affirmative. Reflecting as it does the mental attitude of the students, chiefly of those connected with the groups of the Left, and published entirely at the students' expense, this almanac affords important material for understanding the views of the revolutionary groups of students of that time. We will give here some highly characteristic excerpts from the preface, in which are set down the main political principles of its authors.

[6] *Vestnik Studeniheskoe Kooperatsii Moskovskago Selskokhosyaistvennago Instituta* (*Bulletin of the Students' Coöperative Organizations of the Moscow Institute of Agriculture*).

[7] *Izvestya Studencheskikh Organizatsi Moskovskago Selskokhosyaistvennago Instituta* (*News of the Students' Organizations of the Moscow Institute of Agriculture*).

The War, having upset the life of the country, momentarily overshadowed all other current problems of our life, including that of the destinies of our universities. But this paralysis of public life was bound to pass away sooner or later in the very course of war. In Russia, as in other countries, internal problems have again come to the surface. But, whereas in other countries this return to the current problems of home policy has meant a mere readjustment necessitated by the War, with us it assumed a particularly acute character. We were faced with the tragic shortcomings of our institutions, hindering the free development of the country and at the same time paralyzing its national defense. The instinct of self-preservation tells us that our internal emancipation is urgent, that it cannot be postponed, that it is a condition of the successful conduct of the War. We must lift up and organize the social forces of the country, which alone can resist the imminent calamity of the enemy's invasion and of our economic downfall. We must develop to the fullest possible extent our social activities; every one of us must be conscious of belonging to the community. The students, as one of the elements of the community, as one of the elements of the democracy, cannot remain foreign to this process of organizing social forces. The awakening of students' activities, be it even in the domain of purely professional interests, is undoubtedly of great social importance; for it welds them together, socially speaking, it strengthens their position as a social unit, and enables them to take part in the general social movement as an organized body.

The last words indicate clearly enough the main task which the leaders of this new movement among the students were setting before themselves: their aim was to launch a social movement with a view to "internal emancipation," and to train the young so that they should be ready to take part in it. I have said that the connection between these anti-Government tendencies and the patriotic feelings of the students was not obvious. Indeed, while in some cases the patriotic feelings of those who rose against the Government were quite sincere and genuine, they were sometimes only a cloak wherewith to cover purely revolutionary propaganda. Finally, at the end of February 1917, the whole country, including the most ardent patriots, rose against the Government. But later on patriotism gave way to revolutionary sentiments, and the latter developed into a sheer frenzy of destruction. And it must be said that already at the time to which we are referring, 1915 and 1916, when the leaders of the revolutionary students' groups again raised their voices, the extremists

among them were openly preaching against the War, against any help being given to the Government in carrying it on. They openly flew the revolutionary banner. While not refusing to help the victims of the War, in their hearts they condemned it and were secretly preparing revolution. In a radical Petrograd paper, *Studencheskie Godi*, this point of view was put very clearly. We have already mentioned that in the *Sovremenni Mir*, a monthly magazine of the Left, M. Kleinbort in November 1914 referred to the general patriotism of the students. At that time M. Kleinbort's article called forth no dissent.

In February 1915 I personally had occasion to attend a students' meeting in a canteen organized by the student groups of the Left. At this meeting, though many socialists were present, the old Russian national anthem "God Save the Tsar" was performed with great enthusiasm. But toward the second half of 1915 sentiment had altered. Recollecting the Kleinbort article of the year before, *Studencheskie Godi* protested, on behalf of the students of the Left, against the assertion that these groups, too, shared in the general patriotic enthusiasm. The paper sharply took to task that old revolutionary, Nicholas Morosov, who had spent many years in the Schlüselburg Fortress and who yet was, like Kropotkin and Plekhanov, in favor of the war against Germany. In defining its own position, the paper wrote,[8] "At a time when the populace is suffering severely, when the world is indeed about to be drowned in tears and blood, where is our place if not with the people? Our place, the young democracy's sacred duty, is where the popular masses are wailing and struggling in the clutches of misery and of suffering."

As early as 1915 the revolutionary leaders of Russian youth were declaring that their sacred duty was not on the battlefield, but in the struggle for the happiness of the masses. *Studencheskie Godi*, however, made one reservation: "In rejecting the chauvinistic clamor, the students of the Left are not refusing to take part in the public organizations which help the victims of the War. They form bearer companies for the removal of the wounded and engage in various kinds of relief work for those who have suffered by the War." This was not inconsistent, of course, with the revolutionary ideas of these groups and did not prevent them from conducting at the same time subversive propaganda.

[8] *Studencheskie Godi*, 1915, No. 15.

Of course, these opinions were held only by a section of students. As we have said in the first chapter, political unanimity among the students was non-existent long before the War. But after the change in their mental attitude, as described on the preceding pages, these opinions came to the surface and gradually acquired importance. Their first manifestations date back to the second half of 1915, but at that time they were rather individual utterances. The voices of opposition also made themselves heard in students' resolutions and in the students' press, but they did not as yet venture on loud and open protests. They spoke in vague and abstract terms, and only those people familiar with this abstract and conventional language could guess their real meaning. But in the spring of 1916 the moment came when these conventional formulae were thrown aside. Protests against the War and against the Government were openly expressed here and there. In some of the universities disturbances, such as had been unknown since the War broke out, occurred in the spring of 1916. About the same time meetings at which the lots were to be drawn and the order fixed for calling up students to the officers' training schools were broken up by interruptions. This happened, for instance, at the Moscow Commercial Institute, where the first such meeting, on March 7, 1916, had proceeded amid great enthusiasm. But only a few weeks later another similar meeting had to be closed and transferred to another place because of the loud and persistent protests of a small but energetic minority. Since the mobilization made no distinction between those who wished and those who did not wish to go to the army, and applied equally to all students of a given age and standing, there were naturally among the conscripts some who objected to the mobilization and the War. Some of them declared to their fellow-students that they intended to disintegrate the mass of soldiers as soon as they were sent to the army. The psychology of Zimmerwald and Kienthal, the desire to end the War as soon as possible at any cost, was clearly discernible in the mental attitude of this section of students. If we compare these first manifestations of the students' opposition with the events of the Russian Revolution, we shall see that the most determined leaders of these groups were those Socialist-Internationalists who afterward joined the Communists. In relation to the large mass of students these groups were small, but they showed much energy, perseverance, and fanaticism; therefore, even in the spring of 1916 their utterances

might convey the impression of a mass action. In fact, there were only a few who acted, the great bulk of the students remaining unaffected by this extremist propaganda.

The autumn of 1916 brought about an intensification not only of the various economic crises, but also of the political conflicts. The severance between the Government and the nation was being felt more and more acutely. All sorts of casual and unqualified people utterly incapable of governing the country were becoming Ministers. The ill-omened figure of Protopopov appeared in the post of the Minister of the Interior. Count Ignatiev, who preserved his popularity to the very end, was replaced by Professor Kulchitsky, who was received with general distrust. Finally, at the head of the Government was placed Prince Golitsin, a weak and incompetent man. Professor Kulchitsky began his work by roundly condemning the policy of his predecessor. He is reported to have said that "Count Ignatiev did not take heed of the law," that "the standard of education was lowered during his term of office," that "he was not personally acquainted with the teaching body." The new Minister did not propose to withdraw the bills introduced by Count Ignatiev, but neither would he lend them his support.

The position was strange and without precedent. The Minister was allowing bills, which he did not approve of, to pursue their legislative course, and abstained from putting forward his own proposals for the solution of the most urgent and momentous educational problems. He said that he was "a champion of law and therefore did not intend to do anything without the concurrence of the legislature." From all this it was difficult to make out what was his own program. He afforded an example of that peculiar helplessness and lack of policy which characterized the majority of the ministers of those last days of the reign of Nicholas II. In the face of the extremely complicated and weighty problems of that time, members of the Government appeared to be struck with a strange paralysis of will. They seemed to realize that the current of events was overwhelming them, that something was about to happen which they were powerless to avert. Instead of showing increased energy and strength, the Government became passive and impotent. One felt that it was gradually letting the reins of power slip out of its hands. The very mechanism of government was showing signs of weakness. It yielded under the terrible strain of war-time and of the exceptional conditions. This happened

precisely at the moment when numerous difficulties were arising, and demanded a great effort on the part of the Government. The whole country was deeply dissatisfied with the administration, and there was already a vague but overpowering sense of coming radical changes. At the same time public bodies, which during the thirty months of the War had acquired a great importance, began to insist on their right to take part in the administration and control of State affairs.

How deep and widespread was the feeling of discontent may be seen from the fact that the nobility and even members of the Imperial Family began to sound the note of alarm and to warn the Government. The Congress of Nobility was held in an atmosphere of deep anxiety, which was equally pronounced at the subsequent provincial meetings of the nobility. The resolution adopted at the Novgorod provincial nobility meeting referred to those who "being the product of irresponsible influences, try to cloak their improvidence and their incapacity by criminal lies, and see their duty not in telling the truth, but in flattery." The Moscow nobility, one of the most conservative in Russia, declared "with great feeling and emotion" that "the internal situation of the country is every day becoming more and more dangerous." In the same spirit were conceived the resolutions of other gatherings of the nobility.

But what was happening in the universities during these last months before the Revolution? What was the attitude of the students? I must say that, contrary to what might have been expected, the students instead of indulging in loud and stormy demonstrations kept comparatively quiet. Of course, this quiet was only on the surface; the anti-government groups were accumulating forces. As regards the students in general, they fluctuated between depression and excitement. Not a shadow remained of the patriotic enthusiasm of the first days of the War. But there was a natural reason why all these new and varied emotions did not manifest themselves outwardly; the attention of the whole country was focused just then on the struggle between the Government and the Duma. No one took heed of the students and their anti-government attitude. All were breathlessly watching the development of the great historical drama which was being enacted before them. The students themselves, like the public in general, were wholly absorbed and fascinated. All were expecting something momentous. Under these conditions, disorders

among the students were psychologically out of time and place. Probably, they would have broken out had something extraordinary happened directly affecting their interests. But nothing happened. The new Minister of Education, M. Kulchitsky, adopted a passive policy toward the universities, and during his short period of office—he was appointed only toward the end of December 1916—he did not make himself conspicuous in any way. The atmosphere was highly electrical, but it was so everywhere, and this fact somehow mitigated the excitement among the students. When, on November 1, Milyukov delivered his famous speech in the Duma accusing of high treason not only the Prime Minister, M. Sturmer, but also the Empress and giving expression in sharp terms to the general feeling of discontent, that speech and also the speech of M. Shulgin, who belonged to the Right wing of the Duma, although the publication of both speeches was forbidden, were soon circulated in thousands of copies all over the country, penetrated into the army, and provoked general excitement and upheaval. These were the first signs of the coming Revolution and they showed how feverish and highly strung public sentiment had become.

Work in the universities began as usual in September, and proceeded normally. It was again normally resumed after the Christmas vacation. All the auxiliary scientific institutions likewise followed their ordinary course. Workshops and laboratories were still employed on national defense work, manufacturing, as before, munitions, gauges, gas masks, pharmaceutical articles, etc. But at times the general nervousness and uncertainty told even on these occupations, which had hitherto proceeded so smoothly. It was obvious that events of some kind were at hand. When those events came, it was in a shape that no one had foreseen; and they at once assumed unexpected dimensions. The old power fell with extraordinary rapidity, almost without resistance. In conformity with the limited scope of this monograph, we shall describe the course of the Revolution only so far as may be necessary to explain what occurred in the universities.

CHAPTER IV

UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS DURING THE REVOLUTION OF 1917

The beginning of the Revolution meant for the universities a prolonged cessation of their work. This happened of itself, without the question of such cessation being discussed by anyone. It was evident to all, both professors and students, that it was out of the question to resume work. In the first days after the *coup d'état* the general excitement made it impossible. Afterward, when that excitement had somewhat died down, all agreed that in the first place a new life must be built up, that in every sphere new forms of intercourse must be devised. The resolution of the Moscow Council (*Soviet*) of Students' Deputies is very characteristic in this respect. That council, like many others of its kind, was created after the Revolution. Its very name reflected the true style of the Russian Revolution, which from the very outset had placed alongside of the Provisional Government the Soviet of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies, and later on turned those councils of professional and class representatives into ordinary administrative bodies. The Moscow Council of Students' Deputies united all the students of Moscow and accordingly was their more or less faithful mouthpiece. At a general meeting on March 14, 1917, it discussed the question of resuming studies and pronounced itself in principle in favor of such a course, but with the following curious reservation, "in so far as it will not hinder the students in their intensive organizing and public work." The students wished to appear loyal in the discharge of their academic duties, and therefore did not say simply that university work should be abandoned. But at the same time they indicated that they now had other obligations of a more urgent character. It was evident that such a resolution meant practically that studies could not be resumed, and in fact they were not resumed in the spring of 1917.

The same general meeting of the Moscow Council of Students' Deputies passed another very curious motion, protesting against a resolution adopted by one of the students' associations, the committee for the organization of the students' hostel, demanding the cessation of war. That committee, which was formed before the War, con-

sisted chiefly of the extremist elements and had always been a secret revolutionary society. By protesting against the resolution of that committee, the main organ of the united Moscow students dissociated itself from the extreme revolutionaries, who afterward were incorporated with the Bolsheviks. In the large circles of students the question of continuing or stopping the War was not discussed and no general resolution on this matter was passed. But various students' groups pronounced themselves in favor of supporting the War by all available means, leaving the general question to the Constituent Assembly. It is highly characteristic of the Russian students that after the Revolution the moderate sections became preponderant among them. This was partly due to the fact that the extremists went away and devoted themselves to organizing work in their own parties, and to propaganda among peasants and workers with the object of "deepening the Revolution," as the phrase went. Occasionally they appeared at students' meetings, but they met with little success, and they were not very anxious for such success, believing that their chief task lay elsewhere.

In connection with this it is necessary to mention another singular fact. In the majority of the universities the moderate sections of students came into closer touch than ever with the professors; and these ties became stronger as the Revolution progressed. The stormy course of events, which had evidently shaken society to its foundations, opened such unknown and perilous vistas, that the young involuntarily sought support in the knowledge and experience of their elders, and never before were the explanations of university professors and lecturers on various political, social, and economic questions listened to with so much attention.

We have said that the *rapprochement* between professors and students took place in the majority of the universities. We say majority, because in some of the universities the Revolution had brought about not only a cessation of work, but also a complete disintegration of all academic relations. This was due to various causes. In some instances the students started a campaign against the rector whom they had long disliked and upon whose resignation they were now intent, since conditions permitted it. In other cases conflict arose as a result of the demand of the students for the immediate admission of their representatives to the university councils and for the right of discussing university business. The professors for the most part strongly ob-

jected to such demands, and this led to a struggle which resulted in the complete dislocation of academic life. At the All-Russian Conference of the Delegates of the Universities which was held in Moscow from June 7 to June 10, 1917, it was stated that in many universities "academic life was completely dislocated," owing to the demands of the students and the lack of necessary contact between them and the professors.

In order to make this clear, it is necessary to explain that the demand for the participation of the students in the university councils was of old date. It was first put forward during the students' disturbances in 1905. The students and the junior members of the faculty—lecturers, readers, instructors—elaborated their own theory of university organization, according to which a university consists of three bodies: professors, junior members of the faculty, and students. While not denying the priority of the professors in matters of administration, this theory at the same time claimed that the two other bodies should also be represented in the administrative councils with a right of vote. This view was never shared by the professors; and after close study the theory, as early as 1905, was rejected by the professors of the University of Moscow. The Revolution of 1917 again brought it to the front. It became a general claim and was put forward in all the universities and higher technical schools. In the majority of these, and in the first place in the universities which had their own age-long traditions, special committees were set up by the professors, composed of experienced and respected persons, to deliberate with the students upon their demands. The students concurred readily in this procedure. There followed long and amicable, purely academic conferences; many a mutual misunderstanding was cleared up, and the students soon came to realize that the problem raised by them was more complicated than they had at first imagined. Two facts contributed to the peaceful course of these deliberations: first, that the extremists among the students as a rule did not take part in them, and secondly, that the problems of academic life had lost, in the prevailing conditions of feverish revolutionary development, all their former acuteness. Work was in abeyance at the universities and there was no quarrelling as to whether it should be resumed or not. Except on the fundamental problem of the administration of the universities no exciting academic questions were raised; while all around life was brimful, with its rapid changes,

its daily sensations, its new and urgent political and social duties. Under these conditions the question of the reorganization of the universities had acquired a purely theoretical interest. By the autumn of 1917 it was quite extinct, and remained so until revived, this time by the decrees of the Soviet Government.

I must here again point out that I am speaking only of the majority of universities, in which the inner academic relations remained peaceful and friendly. There were some universities where things did not go so smoothly. There were universities again where the professors yielded to the pressure of the students and admitted their delegates to the university councils. These concessions in their turn led to new complications.

But amid the tremendous events then taking place in Russia, these occasional discords in university life had the appearance of petty family squabbles, of which no one took any notice. The center of gravity lay elsewhere, and what interested most people was not the question, What should the universities be? but, What should Russia be?

As we have already said, all work ceased in the universities, but lecture halls were thrown open for all sorts of meetings, lectures, and conferences regarding the acute problems of the day. The students took part in the organization of these meetings and lectures. In many universities where there were professors of political and social science, these, at the request of the students, delivered special lectures on the subjects that were then interesting everyone. The most prominent of these were the questions of the form of government and of agrarian reform. These two questions interested all parties, for all knew that alongside of political reform stood the agrarian problem. And whereas Russia had before her, in respect of political reform, the examples and experience of western Europe, the second question presented many complications, and each party offered its own solution. It was all the more necessary to have it cleared of obscurities. Alongside these fundamental questions, both students and general public felt great interest in the problem of socialism. Socialists of all shades played from the outset a great part in the Revolution. They put forward steadily and with great energy their own programs and solutions. And although large groups of students did not sympathize with socialism, they wanted to understand its doctrine. The interest taken in all these questions had enormously increased.

Everyone was talking politics, everyone wanted to have some notion of the problems that would confront the nation at the elections to the Constituent Assembly and would afterward be discussed in that Assembly itself.

There are moments in the life of a nation when it is wholly and passionately occupied with some interest—political or perhaps religious. The Russian people after the Revolution were thus absorbed in politics. It seemed that the time had come when everyone, by the exercise of thought and will, could help in shaping the future; for now there was at last full liberty, allowing for such conditions to be established as were best adapted to produce general happiness. It seemed that Russia was about to give other nations the example of the freest constitution and proclaim new principles, as France did in the eighteenth century. Of course, with the younger generation these hopes and expectations took on a particularly ardent and utopian character; needless to say with what enthusiasm hopes of this kind are apt to fill human hearts. It is easy to understand that political interests should have overshadowed all other interests, including interest in the War. As we have already seen, the bulk of the students did not sympathize with the resolutions in favor of stopping the War; but at the same time the War in their minds was relegated to the background. The Revolution had convulsed Russia from top to bottom, as the War had previously done; and under the fresh impression of this new and intensely exciting event people were apt to forget all about the War.

But the younger generation not only yearned for knowledge; they wanted action, and the political parties being the main instruments of political action, there was after the Revolution a great influx of young people into all the existing parties. Some joined the socialists, but a considerable number adhered to the moderately liberal Party of National Freedom or the Constitutional-Democrats (usually referred to as the Cadets). The still more moderate and conservative elements among the students remained outside the parties, since after the Revolution the parties of the Right disappeared from the political arena. Participation in the activities of the parties enabled the students to complete their political education. It was not yet evident that the Russian Revolution, in its extraordinary and mysterious processes, would completely subvert all party programs, and create a situation requiring a new language and new handling. The

students had soon to study political and social problems not only for themselves, but also with a view to spreading political education among the masses. The organs of local government were presently faced with the problem of preparing the popular masses for the coming elections to the Constituent Assembly. The first declaration of the Provisional Government stipulated that the Constituent Assembly was to be elected on the basis of general, direct, equal franchise, and secret ballot. Thus, the whole adult population of Russia was summoned to the polls.

But it was quite obvious that the majority of the population was not in the least prepared for the responsible task it was called upon to perform. Therefore, in Petrograd and in Moscow, and in various other cities, special courses of political education were arranged. Hundreds of people, including students, attended these courses. In the provinces such courses were organized by the zemstvos and associations of village teachers and others. Many students attended these courses also. The zemstvos and associations likewise invited traveling lecturers to speak on political reorganization. Certain zemstvos granted considerable sums for the work of popular political education; thus the Moscow zemstvo made a grant of 100,000 rubles, the Smolensk zemstvo of 80,000 rubles. Some zemstvos, as for instance that of Kostroma, defined the task of the lecturers as that of "acquainting their audiences with current events and explaining their meaning." Even at that time skeptical voices could be heard criticizing this all too hasty attempt to impart political education to the Russian people. Thus, in the magazine *Vestnik Vospitanya*[1] it was remarked that

> lectures and meetings so hastily organized, with the limited object of preparing the population for the elections to the Constituent Assembly could not as a rule possess a genuinely educational character. They were to deal largely with the political topics of the day; they were designed not so much to educate, to awaken critical thought, as to supply ready-made formulae, impose new authorities in place of the old, substitute fresh precepts for those previously accepted.

If we take into consideration that the majority of those who took part in the work of political education were young men and women, and that they had to answer a multitude of heterogeneous and some-

[1] *Vestnik Vospitanya,* March 1917.

times very complicated questions, we shall recognize that the author of the article quoted above was quite justified in his skepticism. Today, at this distance of time, we can see that Russia, as events proceeded, learned more from her severe ordeals than from any course of political education. But at that time many energetic young men gave themselves up to this work with the same passion as had animated their war work.

Turning now to the mental attitude of the professors at the beginning of the Revolution, I must first of all point out that among Russian professors, as among the public in general, all shades of political opinions were represented; there were not only moderates amongst them, but also extremists, both of the Right and of the Left. These last were rather few in number but nevertheless they existed. Thus in the oldest Russian university, that of Moscow, there happened to be among the professors one Bolshevik, Professor Sternberg, Professor of Astronomy. The attitude to the Revolution of these various elements differed considerably. I shall speak here only of the middle stratum among the professors, the men of moderate views, who at that time predominated in all the universities. The elements of the Right dropped into the background, while those of the Left, owing to their small numbers, were of no importance.

In describing the mentality of these moderate liberal professorial circles, it must be said that from the very outset of the Revolution two conflicting sentiments were perceptible in the minds of the Russian professors, feelings of joy and of alarm. The progressive elements could not help hailing the dawn of freedom which the Revolution seemed to have brought with it; but at the same time they were inevitably aware that the Revolution had broken out amid the great difficulties and dangers of war, at a time of intense economic and financial depression, and when the masses of the people were utterly unprepared for the exercise of their political rights. Hence that feeling of alarm which, as the Revolution pursued its headlong course, became more and more acute. I shall give here some concrete illustrations of this mixture of feelings.

On March 11, 1917, there was held an extraordinary meeting of the Council of the University of Moscow. At that meeting it was decided to send a telegram to M. Guchkov, the Minister of War. "We are all aware," ran the telegram, "of the great dangers of the moment, when our enemies are preparing to deal a finishing stroke to

Russia, her independence, and her freedom. . . . We all firmly believe that Russia will pass with honor through the coming severe ordeals." The idea of the coming great dangers was also emphasized by the Council in their appeal to the junior members of the faculty and students, with whom it was decided at the same meeting to get into closer touch. The Council spoke of the necessity of a united stand at that hour of imminent danger.

Equally characteristic are the decisions of the Moscow Union of University Workers. This was created after the Revolution. Its first meeting took place on March 13. Professor Tarassevich was in the chair. About three hundred professors, lecturers, and readers of all the universities and upper technical schools took part in that meeting. The younger element was strongly represented. After the necessary formalities, confirming the constitution of the Union, the first resolution of the new organization was passed welcoming "the free mother country," "the popular power of the Provisional Government," "the Army, our defender, which by its military valor is safeguarding our traditional rights and our young liberties." The resolution ended with the following words: "Long live the great impulse that has awakened to a new life our great Russian people. May it never be extinguished or give place to trivialities." Such were the first wishes in which the joy of freedom was expressed. But at the same time, the Union decided that it ought not only further the work of higher education, but also respond to the enormous needs of the moment, do all in its power for the ultimate success of the struggle against the country's enemy, and, generally speaking, work for the good of the country.

At its next meeting, which took place a week later, on March 20, the Union defined in greater detail the tasks which it was prepared to undertake, and at the same time the great difficulties which were already besetting the new régime. In the first place, the Union saw that the Provisional Government stood in need of advice on social, political, and technical matters. Further, the Union was aware that the situation called for special training in political propaganda, for popular scientific literature, for the coördination of lecturing activities, and for coöperation with the students in their struggle with the ignorance of the country. Finally, the Union was aware how necessary it was to support the All-Russian Unions of Zemstvos and Towns in their work both on behalf of the army and for the organiza-

tion of the country behind it. It laid special stress on the great attention which the acute food crisis demanded from scientists and scientific institutions. In all these directions the Union was ready to offer its active collaboration. Although it was originally created to meet the needs of the universities under new conditions of life, the University Union clearly realized that other tasks were imposed on it by the War and the Revolution. It was well aware of the austere realities and of the difficulties and dangers surrounding the new Government.

I desire to mention here a further interesting testimony to the views current at that time among the professors. This is the editorial article in the March number of *Vestnik Vospitanya*. It was the first number that appeared after the Revolution, and the editorial board had asked a young lecturer of the University of Moscow, M. Rubinstein, to write the leading article. The author, who belonged to the Moderate wing of the Socialists (the People's Socialist Party), gave expression to the sentiments generally prevailing in moderate progressive professorial circles. His article was headed: "Great things unite," and advocated the union of all in the service to their country and the disregard of their private and personal interests.

We must show that we are really champions of freedom, so that no one may reproach us with having been virtuous while we were helpless, and then, on gaining power, with manifesting the same despotic tendencies from the Left against which we protested when displayed from the Right. Therefore, what we need now is not the arming of the population, not strikes and party struggles for power, but work tending to educate the masses.

At that time there was a good deal of talk about the interference of the Petrograd Soviet of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies in the business of government. This interference produced an intolerable situation, and M. Rubinstein's article clearly stated that only a united Government invested with popular confidence could save Russia from external and internal enemies and guarantee the real freedom of elections. M. Rubinstein was also well aware of another great danger then facing Russia.

At a time of great changes, unlimited hopes and expectations pregnant with grave consequences are easily kindled. From the very first days of the Revolution we have been threatened with the terrible danger of confusing political and social issues, a danger that imperils our

cause. The time for social transformation has not yet come. The mingling of political and social revolution, the confiscation of lands, factories, etc., will only be a prelude to deadly civil war, which will rob us of the fruits of our constitutional achievements and throw us into the power of Germany and of reaction.

Finally, M. Rubinstein warned his countrymen against believing that the proletariat was the only factor in the Revolution; to do so would, in his opinion, be a fatal mistake. "Revolution is personified in the whole nation, in all its classes, not only in the proletariat."

These opinions are very significant. They show that from the very outset sober views prevailed even in the younger generation of Russian scholars, that even that younger generation was looking for a peaceful and lawful solution of the problems raised by the Revolution. They firmly believed that only the Provisional Government, whose power was sanctioned by the whole nation, was authorized to deal with those problems, and that only the Constituent Assembly elected by the whole nation could lawfully solve them. Afterward, under the Soviet Government, the universities and the higher technical schools in general became objects of persecution. They were regarded as hotbeds of counter-revolution, whereas previously they had often been considered as hotbeds of revolution. The truth is that the genuine spirit of learning elevates them above the extremes both of revolution and counter-revolution; learning as such, in its essential and profound objectivity, stands above these two antitheses. It would have betrayed its real calling if it had acquired a class or party character and listened to political slogans rather than the voice of truth.

If now, in summing up what we have said about the mental attitude of the professors during the Revolution, we ask ourselves whether they were champions of revolutionary principles, our answer must be in the negative, inasmuch as they were representatives of pure learning. And there is just as little reason to regard them as partisans of reaction. That mixture of joy and alarm, of longing for freedom and fear for cultural values, which was so characteristic of the Russian professors during the Revolution, was precisely an outcome of the spirit of learning and of historical experience. Earlier in the War, in the almanac *Put Studenchestva*, to which we have already referred, one of the revolutionary authors wrote about the moderate

section of the intelligentsia as follows, "Let us remember our Cadets with their fear of the destructive power of the Revolution and their tender care for the preservation of cultural values." The Russian Revolution was so ruthless in its destruction and so regardless of cultural values that the defense of culture against revolutionary destruction seemed amply called for. But precisely that spirit of learning, of culture, of objectivity, which was organically cultivated in higher education, explains why in the further course of the Revolution Russian universities, and after them the higher technical schools, suffered so terribly.

Let us now return to our narrative. Having described the mental attitude of the students and of the professors, in so far as they were reflected in the life of the universities, we must now say something concerning the attitude of the new Government toward these institutions. After the downfall of the old régime the post of Minister of Education was occupied by Professor Manuilov, who in 1911 had been deprived by Kasso of the rectorship of the University of Moscow.[2] The first thing the new Minister did was to recall to the universities all students who had been expelled on account of their political opinions. Next came the question of recalling the professors who had been dismissed, or had resigned of their own accord, during Kasso's term of office. Their total number exceeded one hundred. The question was raised by the universities themselves. The position, however, was complicated by the fact that the chairs of the dismissed professors were now occupied by nominees of Kasso, appointed for the most part without the approval of the university councils. M. Manuilov came to the conclusion that all such professors should be dismissed. His proposal was adopted by the Provisional Government at its meeting of March 11. The universities were at liberty to reëlect the professors who were thus dismissed; but there were only a few such reëlections, while the number of those who were compelled to resign was fairly considerable. In the University of Moscow alone twenty-nine professors were dismissed, of whom seventeen belonged to the School of Medicine.

In some quarters the new Minister of Education was blamed for adopting so drastic a measure, and in practice it had, indeed, created some difficulties. Thus the dismissal of certain professors of medicine who were in charge of clinics left the latter practically without direc-

[2] *See* Chapter I.

tion until new professors were appointed. This was a serious matter at the time, most clinics having been turned into military hospitals. But the Minister himself, in an interview with the Moscow journalists, thus explained his decision, "As regards the universities, I consider it the most important that they should be placed in the position they were in in 1905 when autonomy was granted. The faculty, in order to possess the necessary authority, must be composed of freely elected and not of appointed persons." This point of view clearly showed that the Provisional Government had decided not to interfere with the inner life of the universities, leaving them to manage themselves. Other Ministries, which had their own technical schools, followed the example of the Ministry of Education. Yet, as we have already pointed out, there were questions in the life of the universities that required a uniform solution; such in the first place were the questions of the attitude to be adopted toward the junior members of the faculties and toward the students.

As regards the material situation of the universities there was also some serious ground for alarm. General measures were required. These measures were the object of a preliminary discussion in a special committee on the reorganization of the universities set up by the Ministry of Education on the proposal of Professor Novikov, of the University of Moscow. Among the members of that Committee were several well-known fellows of the Academy of Sciences, professors, and educators. The two Deputy Ministers, Professor D. D. Grimm and M. Gerassimov, were *ex-officio* members of the committee. But in order to discuss the question more thoroughly, it was decided to call a conference of representatives of all universities and higher technical schools of the Ministry of Education. A few days before that conference met, there was held in Moscow from June 7 to 10 the Congress of the All-Russian University Union, which in spite of a great divergence of opinions, showed a marked tendency to discuss all problems in a businesslike way and to arrive at conciliatory decisions. Four delegates of that congress were invited to take part in the Petrograd conference. The Ministry wished to show thereby that it attached importance to the opinion of the large professorial circles. Delegates of the junior members of faculties were also invited to the Conference, an unprecedented step. Altogether over one hundred delegates assembled in Petrograd.

The conference was inaugurated on June 12 by the Minister of

Education, who declared that its object was to discuss certain pressing current problems, and that the congress of Professors, which must discuss the reorganization of the universities in every aspect, was to be postponed in view of the preliminary preparation needed for it. Like the Moscow congress, the conference in Petrograd was unanimous in its decisions. The general tendency was not to emphasize but to reconcile divergent views. The first act of the conference was to confirm the principle of university autonomy, by liberating the universities from the control of the local administration and by giving them a full measure of self-government. Much attention was paid to the question of the relations with the students and the junior members of the faculty. As regards the latter it was unanimously decided to give to those of them who possessed the necessary academic qualifications and performed corresponding duties the right to vote in the executive boards of their respective departments and the right of deliberation in the councils. With equal unanimity was solved the problem of the relations with the students. A scheme was drafted for mixed commissions consisting of delegates of the students and of the professors. The object of these commissions was to make each party acquainted with the needs and wishes of the other, and to discuss in common the current problems of university life and various measures concerning the students. At the same time the students were given great freedom as regards the creation of associations and societies. All the decisions of this conference were adopted by the Ministry of Education and submitted to the Government, and were subsequently promulgated as laws.

When in the autumn of 1917 work was resumed in the universities, there were no longer any internal conflicts. Their inner life and the mutual relations of their various elements had been successfully regulated by the faculty with the assistance of the Ministry of Education. But another side of academic life, the material side, remained to be dealt with. The Petrograd Conference considered this side also, and we know from the foregoing chapter, how dark was the outlook. The financial crisis which was now expounded owed its origin to the War. The three and a half months of the Revolution had aggravated the existing dislocation of university life. But one feature was new: since the Revolution the pace of the economic dislocation had been greatly accelerated. Instead of uniting the whole nation in a single effort, as some were dreaming that it would do, the Revolution had

aroused manifold and contradictory claims from various groups and persons. On the other hand it had finally shattered the already weakened machinery of administration. The State and all its institutions now fell a prey to elemental forces. We here come to the concluding part of our essay, the description of the economic and social consequences of the Revolution as it affected the universities.

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE REVOLUTION UPON UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

To speak of the social and economic effects of the Russian Revolution upon the universities is to speak of their gradual destruction and decay. Whereas the War had greatly dislocated their life by upsetting its economic foundations, the Revolution not only intensified this financial crisis, it did something worse: it destroyed the spiritual principle of the universities, it perverted their essential character, and reduced them to the position of an instrument of the Revolutionary Government, wherewith the latter sought to attain its momentary political aims. Even before the October *coup d'état* which established the power of the Communists, the Russian Revolution had assumed a marked tendency toward political and social anarchy. Such spontaneous movements as revolutions, as they become deeper, inevitably bring with them a dissolution of all the foundations of State and nation. Revolutions often begin with lofty unifying maxims, but presently the centrifugal and destructive tendencies of various groups get the better of these. So it was with the Russian Revolution. Scarcely two months had passed after the overthrow of the old régime when a document was published bearing clear witness to this lamentable tendency. It issued from the Provisional Government itself. It was a manifesto to the nation, published on April 26, 1917, in which the Government spoke bitterly of the beginning of internal disintegration. After proclaiming the desire of the Government "to execute and to safeguard the will of the people" and "to seek its support in moral, not physical, power," the manifesto went on as follows:

> Unfortunately and to the great danger of our freedom, the growth of new social bonds, holding the country together, fails to overtake the process of dissolution caused by the downfall of the old régime. The disposition of various groups and sections of the population to carry out their own wishes and assert claims by means of unlawful usurpation threatens, when it overtakes the less conscious and less organized

sections of the community, to destroy all civic bonds and existing discipline. It will produce conditions favorable to acts of violence, and thus provoke exasperation and hostility to the new régime among the sufferers. It will tend to the neglect of civic duty and the furtherance of private claims and interests in despite of the public good.

It is difficult to find clearer evidence of the destructive power of the Revolution. The Provisional Government for its part had nothing to oppose to this process of dissolution except its faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom and in its own moral force.

This weakness of the Provisional Government, in which the socialists soon began to play the leading part, was severely blamed in various quarters. The attitude of passive observation adopted by the Government in the face of evident disruptive forces seemed incomprehensible and unpardonable. No attempt was made to avoid disaster. And among the voices raised in criticism, those of men of learning were quite unprejudiced, for they were foreign to all party or class considerations. At the end of July 1917, the Rector of the University of Moscow, Professor Menzbir, called a special meeting of the University council to discuss the catastrophic situation of the country. The professors thought it their patriotic duty to point out to the Government whither the Government was drifting. During the discussion of the address to the Government, one of the Socialist members of the Council proposed to include in the address a reference to the necessity of safeguarding the conquests of the Revolution. Thereupon the aged and venerable Professor Anuchin, who has since died, rose and with his usual smile inquired, "Are there any conquests of the Revolution to talk about? The army is destroyed; transport is destroyed; the machinery of food supply is destroyed. We see only the havoc wrought by the Revolution, and no conquests." After a debate, the Council of the University of Moscow addressed a telegram to the head of the Government (then M. Kerensky) warning it against the great dangers threatening the country and recommending resolute measures.

Shortly after, the professors of all the Russian universities had an opportunity of expressing still more effectively their opinion of events. On August 12, what was known as the State Conference[1] was called in Moscow. The Provisional Government was seeking support in the country. It decided therefore to summon some sort of repre-

[1] *See* Gronsky, *op. cit.*

sentative organ, were it even temporary, hastily convoked, and therefore somewhat fortuitous in its composition. The Government desired to make the country aware of the dangers of the situation, and to achieve unity in the face of these dangers. Members of all the four Dumas were invited to the Conference, as also representatives of various public and professional institutions, including the universities. Unfortunately, unity was not achieved. On the contrary, the Conference was throughout sharply divided into two sections—the Right and the Left. On the Right were all those to whom any further spontaneous intensifying of the Revolution was repugnant and who yearned for some elements of order and legality. On the Left were all those who, more or less consciously, either with certain reservations or without any, wished the Revolution to follow its natural course. The terrible situation of the country, with its army demoralized, its food supply completely dislocated, anarchy approaching, and national unity dissolved, was revealed at the Conference. The head of the Government, M. Kerensky, gave a categorical promise to restore order "by blood and iron," and to "sacrifice his soul," if need be, for the salvation of Russia. But as was rightly remarked at the time by the political reviewer of *Vestnik Evropi*,[2] "some did not believe in, others did not sympathize with these promises; behind the forceful and menacing phrases one could detect the misgivings of a Government that was hanging in the air and knew not where to look for support."

Among other speeches the declaration of Professor D. D. Grimm on behalf of the academic institutions was listened to with great attention: "Our country is in danger, it is on the verge of disaster," said he,

> and at this fateful moment the representatives of Russian learning, obeying the voice of disciplined reason alone and ignoring all party influences whatsoever, make this declaration: The whole country with a rare unanimity has risen against the old régime and overthrown it. To the Provisional Government was entrusted, until the Constituent Assembly should be elected, the safeguarding of order and of the country's national defense. Instead, the country has been reduced to a lamentable condition. Her defense is weakened, her army is suffering from grave disease. A shameful anarchy that fills us with dismay has spread all over the country. There is no authority, no obedience. The unity of the

[2] *Vestnik Evropi*, September-December, 1917.

State is disappearing and we lie under the menace of civil war. Class groups pursue their own aims, and dislocation is attaining its climax. Industrial productivity is declining. Mutual hostility and exasperation are growing. The country is threatened with famine and is on the verge of bankruptcy. The Provisional Government, which should have represented the whole nation, is becoming increasingly dependent on class interests, thus contributing to the growth of public discontent and to the elimination of the very idea of nationhood from the popular consciousness. It has said too little about discipline and about duties, thus dulling the public conscience. We are ourselves to a great extent to blame for this anarchy. The soil was made ready for it by the old régime, and the Provisional Government has not counteracted that pernicious influence.

The statement ended with the expression of a wish that the Government should become united and strong, should defend culture, and should strengthen the foundations of the State. There was, indeed, no party bias in this declaration; on the contrary, to all party demands it opposed the interests of the State and the claims of the nation as a whole. It constituted a severe indictment of the Provisional Government, and the impression it produced was particularly strong since it was based upon the incontestable principles of political science. Although the declaration ended with the wish that the Government might follow a new path, there was little hope of this, as the declaration itself showed conclusively. It may therefore be described as a very pessimistic forecast. It made no reference to the effects of the general process of dissolution upon the position of the universities. But it need hardly be said that this process inevitably entailed their complete disorganization.

As we have already seen, this disorganization was proceeding more rapidly as a result of the Revolution. The constant demands for increase of salaries, the enormous rise in the cost of living, the inflation of the currency—all these mutually interwoven factors developed with great intensity. They resulted in greater expenditure for the remuneration of the lower personnel, and for the purchase of fuel, and scarcely anything was left to meet the other requirements of the universities. The difficulties became particularly great after September 1917, when study was at last resumed. The resumption took place without any impediment. Complete order reigned, but there were very few students, especially in the universities, though the

deficiency was also noticeable in the higher technical schools. There were of course some freshmen who had just graduated from secondary schools, but the number of senior students had dwindled to insignificance. Even in the Faculty of Law students were numbered by ones, instead of hundreds. The inaugural lectures of the most popular professors were attended by four or five students. It is true, however, that these four or five students attended lectures throughout the term.

The academic year 1917-1918 passed amid exceptional circumstances; the stormy development of all the revolutionary processes, the October *coup d'état*, the passing of power into the hands of the Bolsheviks—such were the catastrophic events of that year. Yet in spite of this, normal academic work was interrupted only in so far as the fighting in the streets and the general breakdown of normal conditions in the city rendered inevitable. The few students who wished at all costs to pursue their studies continued to attend lectures and laboratories throughout that extraordinary year. But why were there so few students? Why did the Revolution work such devastation in the universities? For two main reasons: the increase of economic difficulties and the absorption of the students in political occupations. The first cause made itself felt, as we know, long before the Revolution, especially in the large cities. Its influence now became intensified.

But another quite different cause was added to it. The opening of the Constituent Assembly was fixed by the Provisional Government for November 19, 1917. The announcement of this, of course, set in movement all political parties. The election campaign began, with its numerous meetings, with its journeyings to and fro over the country. Russia with her 150 millions of population presented a wide field for political activities. The students, as the youngest and most active members of the parties, took to this new political work with great zeal and enthusiasm. The beginning of the preliminary campaign coincided with the commencement of studies in the universities, and the many students who had been engaged since the spring in the work of political propaganda in various localities were naturally loath to abandon it at this critical moment. And then, before that work was over, a fresh Revolution occurred: on October 25, 1917 the Bolsheviks overthrew the Provisional Government and proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Date Due

MAY 31 '48
JUN 1 '48
MAY 4 '49
MAY 31 '50
MAR 27 1954
MAR 16 1955
APR 1 1955
APR 19 1955
APR 4 1956
JUN 3 1959
MAY 24 '61
MAY 2 '62
JE 3 '64
MAY 8 1968

LA832 76287
.R8

Russian schools and universitites in the World war

DATE	ISSUED TO
MAY 31 '40	Mg Christiansen
JUN 1 '40	Alvine Steeburg
MAY 4 '49	D. L.
MAY 3 '50	Herbert Thom

LA832 76287
.R8

ST. OLAF COLLEGE
LA832 .R8
Russian schools and universities i
3 0111 00220 6950